



Portrait of Lorenzo Valla, from J. Boissard, *Bibliotheca sive thesaurus virtutis et gloriae in qui continente . . .* (Frankfurt, 1628). (See pp. 250-51.)



ogy (actually he knew little Greek) and, in particular, whether or not he used the Byzantine Maximos the Confessor's exegesis of Dionysius, with its more systematic organization and greater emphasis on the person of Christ.<sup>34</sup>

For the cosmopolitan Erasmus, the Greek Fathers were especially important in furthering his cherished program of "Christian humanism." Remarkably, they were of greater significance in his mind than the Latin Fathers. Indeed, it appears that Erasmus even borrowed his famous phrase "philosophy of Christ" from the Greek Fathers, the Apologists and Alexandrians.<sup>35</sup> Like Lefèvre, Erasmus was vitally interested in the question of Christian origins and especially in the original teachings of Christianity. And yet, again like Lefèvre, he was not particularly drawn to Dionysius. Indeed, in 1505 he had published the works of Valla in which Valla questioned the authenticity of the Dionysian writings.<sup>36</sup> Erasmus's views of the relative importance of the principal Greek and Latin Fathers show surprising perspicacity as well as an independence of judgment remarkable for his time.<sup>37</sup> Of the greatest Greek Fathers (for whom Erasmus had only the highest esteem) he calls Basil clear and natural, Chrysostom persuasive, and Gregory of Nazianzus, a writer with finesse. On the other hand, though he had tremendous regard and affection for Jerome in particular, Erasmus criticized the Latins Ambrose as obscure, Tertullian as difficult and gossipy, and Augustine as too digressive "like the Africans in general."<sup>38</sup>

Erasmus read the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom for instance, not only for their moral teachings but, it would seem, to further his never-faltering ideal of a united Christendom, particularly at a time when the unity of Christendom was in grave jeopardy. (We may recall the parallel views of the earlier Byzantines Cydones and Planudes with respect to the Latin Fathers Augustine and Thomas.) Knowledge of the Greek Fathers was particularly useful to Erasmus in his dispute with Luther. Indeed, it seems safe to say that, in his view, the writings of the Greek Fathers, many of whom were even closer in time than the Latins to the fountainhead of Christianity, strongly exemplified and reflected the unity of the church. Why, then, should Luther be permitted to shatter this traditional unity, especially when several of his chief views were directly based on certain ideas of Augustine which, or at least Luther's use of which, Erasmus did not look upon with favor?

Erasmus, moreover, seemed to have found in the Greek Fathers confirmation for his condemnation of papal claims to temporal power

wh  
an  
Er  
be  
ren  
los  
ent  
Era  
wh  
beli  
awa  
as  
he s  
I  
mus  
mar  
have  
rega  
to th  
they  
first  
whol  
adde  
Af  
of th  
print  
out, g  
unpri  
andri  
theolo  
(Genr  
Turks  
Trave  
tine L  
the He  
refute  
ever, v  
the ch  
conside  
It sh  
of the F  
almost



and for his views on the nature and unity of the church.<sup>39</sup> Strikingly, Erasmus considered Origen, that is, the "rehabilitated" Origen, to be the greatest of the Greek Fathers. (One may recall Erasmus's remark that one page of Origen is worth more for Christian philosophy than ten of Augustine.)<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, despite his great enthusiasm for the ancient Greek Fathers, it does not seem that Erasmus had too high a regard for the late Byzantine theologians—whose empire he, like other humanists of the West such as Reuchlin, believed had fallen to the Turks as divine punishment for breaking away from the Roman church. And yet when he defines the church as "the consensus of the Christian people throughout the world," he seems, at least by implication, to include the Greeks.<sup>41</sup>

In any synoptic treatment of Greek Patristic first editions, Erasmus must occupy an important, if not the chief, place. For his editions mark, in certain ways, the climax to the entire movement. Scholars have, to be sure, extensively investigated aspects of his work in this regard. But the results have not always been used, as they should be, to throw light on the sources of his Christian humanism. Nor have they been integrated into a larger, comprehensive account of Greek first editions. This is significant, for when viewed in the light of the whole development, research on individual Greek Fathers takes on an added, sometimes even a rather different, meaning.

After Erasmus's death in 1536, and especially during the last part of the sixteenth century, his aims seemed to predominate in the printing of Patristic Greek editions. More complete texts were sought out, greater textual accuracy was striven for, and editions of hitherto unprinted Fathers appeared: Gregory of Nyssa, Clement of Alexandria, Epiphanius, and others.<sup>42</sup> Soon even certain late Byzantine theologians began to be published, for example, George Scholarios (Gennadios), the last Byzantine patriarch and the first under the Turks.<sup>43</sup> (As we have seen, already in the early fifteenth century Traversari had translated the work of the fourteenth-century Byzantine Latinophile theologian, Manuel Calecas, on the procession of the Holy Spirit [filioque] but this had been largely in order to help refute the Orthodox position.)<sup>44</sup> By the late sixteenth century, however, with publication of most of the corpus of the Greek Fathers, the chief criterion for publication seems to have become less the consideration of utility than scholarship—that is, philology.<sup>45</sup>

It should be noted that it was not until the 1550s that publication of the Fathers in the original *Greek* text became general; previously, almost everything published had been in *Latin* translation. (No



part of Origen's work, for example, appeared in Greek until 1602.) This may most easily be explained by the greater exigencies of Greek scholarship. But not to be overlooked is the interesting fact that in 1567, when Pope Pius V declared St. Thomas a Doctor of the Church, he shortly thereafter (in 1568) also officially exalted four Greek Fathers—Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Chrysostom, and Athanasius—also declaring them Doctors of the Church.<sup>46</sup>

To turn, in conclusion, exclusively to the role of the Byzantine scholar-exiles in the West, how they catered to Western humanist tastes by translating, editing, and publishing first editions of *classical* Greek works is by now well known. But given the increasingly strong (but still all too insufficiently recognized) Western humanist interest in the Greek Fathers (already in 1499 Aldus Manutius had the Cretan Marcus Musurus edit several letters of St. Basil's for his press),<sup>47</sup> it would seem only logical that these exiles would have published, besides classical works, Patristic writings, not only to cater to rising interest among Latin readers, but also for the benefit of their own fellow Greeks. I have on several occasions quoted the prophetic words of Bessarion, who left his great library of Greek manuscripts to Venice not only for the use of Western scholars but, as he elsewhere so clearly implied, to benefit his own countrymen who, under the Turks, were in grave danger of becoming not only slaves but culturally barbarized.<sup>48</sup> There is no doubt that a feeling of patriotism also motivated other Greek exiles of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries—such as George of Trebizond and Zacharias Calliergis in Italy, and Demetrius Ducas in Spain and Italy—to edit and publish first editions of Greek Fathers, of the Greek New Testament text (see chap. 9 for Ducas' vital role in editing Ximenes' Polyglot Bible), and of Orthodox liturgical books for the practical, daily worship of their fellow Greeks in the West.<sup>49</sup>

Of cardinal importance, then, as the last step in relations between the Byzantine and Western Renaissance worlds, was the rising interest among Western humanists in the Greek Church Fathers. Not only did this indicate increasing Western appreciation for a neglected but truly fundamental aspect of their own Christian heritage, but it demonstrated that even in the religious sphere, so long marked by controversy, some theologians and humanists of the Latin kindred culture, by emphasizing translations and original Greek texts of the Fathers, were able to foster a deeper awareness of the underlying cultural and ecclesiastical unity of the two great halves of Christendom.

The  
divi  
long  
As v  
the  
para  
peop  
cum  
toler  
peci  
fund  
At  
less c  
in th  
grad  
Ages  
and  
turn  
in ce  
grad  
Re  
the fa  
in res  
milita  
tions  
cultur  
Byzar  
emoti  
ern sta  
Greek  
while  
cultur



## Epilogue: The "Sibling" Cultures and the Effects of the Acculturative Process

The preceding chapters, focusing on societies, institutions, and individuals, have served to illumine the contours of an extraordinarily long and intricate interaction of the Byzantine and Latin cultures. As we have seen, the patterns of their relationship first took shape in the early fourth century when the sibling civilizations began to separate out of the Christianized late Roman Empire. Though the two peoples possessed a certain common heritage, it was this very circumstance which sometimes made it all the more difficult for them to tolerate even apparently minor cultural differences. This was especially true of problems that served to obscure deeper differences fundamental to the uniqueness of the respective societies.

At the outset, in the fourth century the two cultures were more or less equally advanced—that is, on a par intellectually speaking. But in the West, because of political, social, and economic forces, a gradually worsening cultural lag (usually referred to as the "Dark Ages") set in, marked by an increasing diminution of secular interests, and notably the disappearance of Greek learning.<sup>1</sup> These forces in turn resulted not only in an infrequency of cultural contacts, but even in certain respects (political and religious schism in particular) in the gradual development of a genuine rivalry between the two societies.

Rendering the problem of cultural interaction more complex was the fact that various strata in the same society might react differently in response to the same stimuli. With the changes in the political and military status of each civilization vis-à-vis the other, came modifications in the attitudes of groups within each society toward the other culture. When the Byzantine state and society were dominant, most Byzantines tended naturally to feel superior and secure socially, emotionally, and culturally. But when, in later centuries, the Western states and their society began to revive and even to challenge the Greek, the Byzantines began to feel increasingly on the defensive, while clinging even more tenaciously than ever to their belief in their cultural superiority. Indeed, as we have seen, the more the framework



of their society collapsed, the more culturally and religiously threatened the Byzantines felt.

The Latins, on the other hand, in time became hardly less antagonistic toward the Byzantines. Accusing the latter of treachery in the Crusades and irritated by two Greek rejections of ecclesiastical union (signed at Lyons in 1274 and again in Florence in 1439—see chaps. 8 and 11), most Westerners (with certain exceptions) became more and more contemptuous of what their chroniclers were wont to call the "perfidious, cowardly, schismatic" Greeks. All these factors were reflected, on both sides, in tendencies toward cultural attraction or repulsion. And it is these considerations which constitute, perhaps, the most subtle, elusive factor in any attempt to reduce to meaningful patterns the cultural relations between the two at once similar and yet disparate societies in the vast period under discussion.

In the Prologue, two approaches to the problem of cultural interaction were taken: (1) the historical unfolding of events from a chronological point of view, and (2) the presentation of a schema in terms of modes of acculturation.<sup>2</sup> Of the four chronological stages of interaction as delineated in the Prologue, the long first phase (330–1096) was marked, not surprisingly, by an increasing degree of Latin borrowing from Byzantine civilization. This, as observed (especially in chap. 3), was with few exceptions an almost entirely one-sided proposition, the West, then vastly inferior culturally, being the main and in most respects the sole beneficiary. Suffering for long from the chaos resulting from the waves of invasions—not to mention internal anarchy—the West, in its semibarbarian state, was hardly in a position to influence the East except in certain minor, usually rather superficial, respects. Nevertheless, the fact that the West was undergoing the tortuous process of integrating its own cultural elements—especially the most alien, the Germanic—into one organic synthesis, served to give rise to new tendencies in the West which themselves led to different attitudes toward government and socioeconomic life. With respect to ecclesiastical discipline and ritual in particular, the West, with the passing of the centuries, became more flexible in its approach than the East, which remained in many ways more conservative—a fact that was at once the Byzantine church's chief strength and sometimes its weakness.<sup>3</sup>

In the second chronological phase (1096–1261), culminating after 1204 in the Latin Crusader occupation of most of the Byzantine Empire, the Westerners exerted pressures against and soon came to

THE E

domin  
but di  
tably,  
a certa  
after 1  
tion c  
mana  
prima  
practi  
etc.—  
occup  
marri  
virtua  
zens.<sup>4</sup>

Neve  
nobles  
got al  
more  
it was  
somet  
despit  
the p  
Weste  
examp  
mome  
and ju

With  
with  
Greek  
chant  
new p  
state  
techni  
makin

For  
is und  
and c  
Easte  
result  
ments



dominate the East politically, militarily, and at times ecclesiastically, but did not, consciously or otherwise, transform it culturally. Inevitably, however, because of the mass settlement of Latins in the East, a certain accommodation, or social and cultural symbiosis, took place after 1204, though by no means can it be said that any true integration of cultures resulted. For although the two societies usually managed to live at peace with one another in the East, friction in the primary areas of social relations—marriage, religious beliefs and practices, questions relating to citizenship and political allegiance, etc.—did not disappear. For example, we know that in the Latin-occupied Morea (as later in the Catalan Duchy of Athens) mixed marriages were at first forbidden by the ruling Western feudal class, virtually all the Greeks being considered second- or third-class citizens.<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, in Byzantium certain classes of Greeks and Latins—nobles, merchants, and frequently *politique*-minded statesmen—often got along better than did the common people, who in general clung more tenaciously to the prejudices of centuries. Above all, however, it was the Greek monks who acted as the conservative religious, and sometimes even cultural, “conscience” of their people.<sup>5</sup> And yet despite, or on occasion even because of, Latin coercion exercised in the political and religious spheres, some aspects of the disparaged Western culture managed to seep into the Greek East. One specific example we have noted is the Byzantine adoption of, or rather momentary recourse to, the Western legal practices of ordeal by fire and judicial duel.

With masses of Westerners living in the East and associating daily with the Byzantines, cultural influences still largely flowed from Greeks to Latins. Thus, in the period of the Crusades, Latin merchants and knights who returned to the West brought back not only new political and social ideas (a view of the workings of a centralized state and certain new writings of Aristotle, for instance) but new techniques to be utilized in such activities as fortress-building, glass-making, or silk manufacture.

For the social scientist, the third chronological phase (1261–1453) is undoubtedly the most interesting one for the study of social change and cultural interaction. For now Latin culture, in part through Eastern tutelage during the first and second phases and in part as a result of its own maturation through integration of its cultural elements, had finally achieved parity with, in a few instances even



superiority over, the East. The inevitable result was a direct confrontation of two advanced societies and their cultures—a type of phenomenon as noted, not yet carefully studied by sociologists. Since the period of the earlier Crusades, when large groups from the two peoples were first brought together en masse in the East, contacts were becoming more and more frequent. Economically, up to and even beyond 1453, the Italian maritime powers continued to try to expand, or at least to maintain control over, the lucrative Eastern markets, to the increasing detriment of the Byzantine economy. Ecclesiastically, the developing Turkish threat brought the need for more frequent negotiations for religious union. Intellectually, as the movement of the Renaissance in the West with its growing mania for ancient manuscripts progressed, Italian humanists began to scour the East for every remaining vestige of ancient Greek learning.<sup>6</sup> Yet most Westerners continued to draw a gratuitous distinction between the ancient Hellenes and the contemporary Greeks (that is, Byzantines), as is reflected in the humanist Petrarch's famous statement expressing preference for the enemy Turks over the "schismatic Greeks who are worse than enemies and fear and hate us with all their souls." Pope Pius II put it more sympathetically after Constantinople's fall in 1453, when he stressed that "this is the second death of Homer and Plato." Nevertheless, to most Italian humanists the fate of medieval Byzantium was of only secondary concern.<sup>7</sup>

In this same third period, as we have noted more than once, pressures were exercised, directly or indirectly, by the West (the papacy and Latin missionaries in particular) on the East for conformity, particularly in the religious sphere. So coercive and distasteful did these pressures seem that a large segment, especially from among the lower, less literate class of Byzantine society, became alienated from its leaders, who often, as noted, pursued a policy of appeasement or, as the group itself perceived it, of a kind of "religious acculturation" toward Rome. And it was this intransigent resistance of the tenaciously conservative common folk and the even more fanatically antiunionist monks that erupted into what we have termed a "nativistic reaction." This "nativistic reaction" on the part, it should be noted, of the less educated Byzantines, usually stressed the traditional liturgical forms of Orthodox worship (use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, for example—see especially chap. 8).

This phenomenon in the lower classes found a more sophisticated analogue in certain upper-class, more educated social groups, which

TH  
like  
Th  
We  
des  
tur  
ecu  
Gr  
ant  
tho  
phi  
vie  
nat  
cul  
retu  
a h  
tha  
Pal  
T  
lect  
loga  
cou  
stap  
cent  
auth  
influ  
part  
chal  
up"  
the i  
aspe  
and  
So  
patte  
True  
by Is  
But a  
conq  
towar  
twelft  
empe



likewise wished to preserve the integrity of their state and culture. Their response to the dual challenge of the Turks and especially the West during the last two centuries became increasingly expressed in a desire not only to preserve traditional forms of worship but also to turn back to and revivify the theological pronouncements of the seven ecumenical councils and the writings of the fourth- and fifth-century Greek Church Fathers. But, as we have seen in the Prologue, this antiunionist group of the intellectual elite at the same time included those who also stressed a reversion to the writings, literary and philosophic, of *ancient* Greek culture—a development that must be viewed in the context of a Byzantine state now shorn of its multinational character and consisting exclusively of a Hellenic society and culture (see chap. 2). It was this phenomenon of a more intensive return, even proud appeal, to *ancient* Greek scholarship, expressed in a heightened sense of Hellenic, not Roman (Byzantine) patriotism, that played an important part in helping to spark the so-called Palaeologan Renaissance.

This cultural-ethnic response on the part of the upper-class intellectuals was certainly not the only factor in the etiology of the Palaeologan Renaissance, with its stress on a return to past roots. For of course ancient Greek literature and philosophy had always been a staple of Byzantine education, though sometimes, as in the eleventh century, it was accepted only with serious reservation by ecclesiastical authorities because of its pagan content.<sup>8</sup> The increasing Latin influence in the period of the Palaeologan Renaissance may, for its part, have had a positive as well as a negative side. Through its challenge to, sometimes cross-fertilization with, or at least “shaking up” of, Byzantine cultural elements, it may have provided a part of the impetus for a “revitalization,” a new burst of life and creativity in aspects of Byzantine civilization such as painting, mystical thought, and a more intensive, now synthetic study of ancient Greek literature.

Some Greeks were convinced that Byzantine cultural and religious patterns would survive better under Turkish than Latin domination. True, the widespread supplantation of Greek culture in Asia Minor by Islam was clearly manifest by the fifteenth century, if not earlier. But at least up to the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Turkish conquerors of Asia Minor generally had exhibited marked tolerance toward Greek religion and culture.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, as early as the late twelfth century a Greek patriarch had voiced to the Latinophile emperor Manuel I Comnenus the view that subjugation to the



Muslims would not force conversion to Islam, but "under Frankish rule and union with the Roman Church I may have to separate myself from my God."<sup>10</sup>

To many Byzantines of the last two centuries before 1453 the prospect of aid from the West seemed very uncertain—witness the constant internecine struggles of the Italian states, the Hundred Years War between France and England, and the intransigent papal attitude with respect to religious negotiation and military assistance. Worse, papal aid in the form of the coming of armies and numerous Latin clerics to their land to oppose the Turks was felt by these Greeks to be even more insidious, for in their view it might result not only in renewed political and ecclesiastical domination, but ultimately in large-scale assimilation, possibly even absorption, of most of Byzantine culture into the Latin.

Our fourth chronological phase (ca. 1453–1600), in large part post-Byzantine, witnessed the exportation of the intellectual harvest of the Palaeologan Renaissance by Byzantine intellectuals and painters who carried it to the West in an emigration that we have termed a Greek diaspora. Despite the numbers of Greeks who went westward and the remarkable success of some émigré-scholars in securing professorial chairs in Latin universities, it cannot be said that any genuine integration of the various Greek communities established in the West into the mainstream of Western society took place. Even the Greek colony of Venice, the most significant of all, always remained an ethnic subculture of the Venetian. Thus the inhabitants of this colony were not considered to possess all the rights of Venetian citizens, though honorary citizenship—witness the case of Demetrius Cydones<sup>11</sup>—was sometimes bestowed upon the more noted of the Greek scholars. The most significant of the Byzantine savants generally lived with their Italian patrons or in a university setting outside the Greek colony, but this was primarily for professional reasons. In spite of their coexistence, both peoples were aware that the Greeks were not fully accepted by the host society, certainly not into the stratum of the latter's power elite.<sup>12</sup>

Given the Western reception of important aspects of the Palaeologan intellectual Renaissance, the chief cultural beneficiary in this, our fourth and last chronological period, was again the West. But this is not to diminish the significance of the growth of Western civilization, which by now had developed an even more remarkable creativity of its own. Indeed, the principal institutions or monuments of



Western medieval civilization at its height earlier in the thirteenth century—for example, parliaments, Gothic cathedrals, centralized feudalism, and universities—owed little or nothing to Byzantine institutions or culture. Yet at the same time, it seems clear (see chap. 13) that without the later contacts of the Italian humanists with the intellectual émigrés from the Byzantine East, the development of the Italian Renaissance, certainly in Quattrocento Florence, would have taken another course.

As for the converse question, Latin cultural influence on the Greek East did, as has been shown (in chap. 4 especially), pervade certain aspects of Byzantine thought during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. Yet neither Western theology nor philosophy was able, organically, to penetrate Byzantine thought: the core of Byzantine culture remained entirely Greek. Thus, in this most crucial encounter in the Greek homeland, despite virtual Western saturation of Byzantine society, Greek culture proved itself the stronger.<sup>13</sup> In the long run the only near-permanent inroads made into Greek culture were in the areas of Venetian-dominated Crete and the Ionian isles.<sup>14</sup> And with the Turkish conquest of Crete in 1689, it too reverted to traditional Greek patterns of life and thought.

Having briefly summarized the principal characteristics of each chronological period, what conclusions may be drawn with respect to the three modes, or tripartite typology, of cultural influence suggested in the Prologue? I must at once emphasize, as should have been apparent in some of the chapters, that these various modes of acculturation do not necessarily coincide with any particular chronological order. Nor, in fact, are they mutually exclusive; two or more modes sometimes coexisted, if in different strata of society. To take an extreme case, our third chronological period (1261–1453), reflects not only the third mode of cultural interaction—confrontation of two advanced societies—but also the first mode, in the form of certain aspects of increasing political, economic, and ecclesiastical “hegemony” (dominance) of one society (Latin) over the other (Greek).

Moreover, as already noted, this third period, in the variety of responses elicited to the challenge of the West, reflects at least two

\* (1) Dominance of one culture with assimilation of cultural elements by the other; (2) amalgamation producing a new type of cultural synthesis; and (3) confrontation of two culturally advanced societies. “Nativistic reactions” and “revitalization movements” may result as responses to any or all three of these modes.



important and differing social phenomena—a "nativistic reaction" on the part of the large, vigorously dissenting segment of the common people, monks, and lower clergy, and many of the middle class, and also "revitalization movements" on the part of the higher classes, especially among the intellectual elite. While the lower classes blindly rejected the Western religious and cultural challenge, the reaction of the upper, more sophisticated strata was a seeking somehow to come to terms with it without sacrificing what each group considered fundamental to its religious and cultural values.

The best example of our first mode or type of acculturation, the dominance over or strong influence of one society or culture upon another, is found in the first chronological period (330–1096) when, after initial parity, an increasing cultural lag occurred in the West. But as we have seen, this dominance was not uniform, for Byzantine influence was then exercised only piecemeal—by infiltration, so to speak. At this time the "contact situations" between the two societies were rarely of a prolonged nature, but were rather sporadic and were exercised largely through individuals (merchants, mercenaries, pilgrims, ambassadors, or even wandering scholars). It should not be forgotten that in the earlier centuries Western society was simply not ready to accept the more sophisticated ideas and practices of the East. However, when later the Westerners were in a position to understand Byzantine cultural phenomena, they generally absorbed them with little resistance. One reason for the ease of Western receptivity, given the pervasive influence of religion in this age, was that until 1054 the churches, despite an occasional quarrel (most notably that known as the "Photian schism" of the later ninth century)<sup>15</sup> were still in communion, and therefore other aspects of life had not yet been unduly affected by religious enmity.

Our second mode of acculturation, that of the amalgamation or fusion of cultures to produce a new kind of cultural synthesis, does not seem to be identifiable in any really clear form. Something akin to it, however, may perhaps be distinguished in our fourth chronological period (before 1453 to 1600), in the interaction of the two cultures taking place on Western soil. At that time, as a result of the Greek diaspora (and the fact that no "ethnic" or religious threat was posed to *Western* culture), Byzantine scholars made a crucial contribution to the development of the Italian Renaissance in the form of the original texts of classical Greek authors and Byzantine interpretations thereof—recall our emphasis on Byzantium's role as

THE EF

a cultu  
instrum  
ing of  
the ori  
shifted  
a move  
(see ch  
develo  
theless  
between  
in sever  
tian cu

But  
and so  
fication  
cultural  
chronic  
West f  
and th  
it from  
uinene  
tines v  
Latins  
Wester  
superior  
threat  
was co  
tines to  
Greek  
custom

It w  
as mar  
zantine  
Greeks  
lead no  
ual pro  
tion in  
Greek  
filioque  
Lyons,



a cultural filter from antiquity. This Byzantine contribution was instrumental in producing not a truly new synthesis but a restructuring of the principal components of Western humanism. As a result, the orientation of Italian, in particular Florentine, humanism was shifted from a purely Latin rhetorical movement in its earlier phase to a movement primarily emphasizing Greek philosophy and literature (see chap. 13).<sup>16</sup> This new orientation had no little effect on the development of the Renaissance in northern Europe as well. Nonetheless, no complete cultural fusion ever seems to have taken place between the Byzantine and Latin societies, except, as we have noted, in seventeenth-century Crete, where a kind of hybrid Cretan-Venetian cultural synthesis did for a time emerge.<sup>17</sup>

But it is our third mode of acculturation, neglected by historians and sociologists alike, that requires the most clarification and amplification—the encounter of two major, more-or-less equally advanced, cultural traditions, a phenomenon manifested especially in our third chronological period. In this third period (1261–1453), when the West first sought to reconquer Constantinople from the Byzantines and then, beginning in the mid-fourteenth century, rather to “save” it from the Turks, most Greeks could never be convinced of the genuineness of Western concern for their welfare.<sup>18</sup> Because the Byzantines were now much weaker politically and militarily than the Latins—on the defensive with their backs to the wall—they felt that Western culture, now seemingly more dynamic theologically and superior technologically to that of the East, posed a more ominous threat to the existence of Greek culture than ever before. This feeling was confirmed by repeated Western proposals to convert the Byzantines to “Catholicism” by means of educating large groups of young Greek boys not only in the Latin faith but in Latin letters and Latin customs.

It was precisely this kind of penetration, the most effective means—as many Greeks sensed—of cultural transformation, that the Byzantines above all feared.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, it may be said that the bulk of the Greeks believed, or intuitively felt, that religious conversion would lead not only to ecclesiastical and political domination but to a gradual process of “cultural” Latinization as well. Reflecting the conflation in the Greek mind of faith and culture is the remark of one Greek prelate at the Council of Florence: “I will not accept the *filioque* and be Latinized.”<sup>20</sup> And earlier in 1274, after the Council of Lyons, when the several legates of the Greek emperor returned to



Constantinople, it was (and this deserves repetition) the Constantinopolitan rabble, the lowest stratum of society, that articulated this underlying anxiety of the Greeks by shouting, "Efrangeapses!" ("You have become a Frank!"—in other words, by changing your religion you have changed your culture and "nation"). One might take note also of the story told by Syropoulos, the "nationalistic," rabidly antiunionist Greek historian of the Council of Florence who seems best to expose the inner feelings of most of his countrymen. Thus he tells of the Greek parish priest who was accused by his Greek parishioners of "becoming pro-Latin" ("*Latinizon*") because, after the signing of union at the council, he had concelebrated with the Greek prounionist patriarch, Metrophanes.<sup>21</sup> It was, then, this mixed but largely lower-class group of Byzantine society (including of course the monks) which clung most tenaciously to the traditional orthodox forms of liturgical worship.

In contrast to the more numerous, ignorant, lower classes, almost totally caught up in the "nativistic reaction," the upper, educated classes responded in a variety of ways, depending primarily on which threat they considered to be more serious for the preservation of their ethnic and cultural identity. One upper-class group opposed religious union under any circumstances, preferring, like some among the lower classes, a Turkish conquest to religious and cultural capitulation to the hated Latins. Another group, more politically sophisticated, favored ecclesiastical union with Rome for the sake of political expediency—that is, it supported application of the concept of *economia* to church affairs (see especially chaps. 2 and 8) in order to preserve the life of the state.

Still a third, very important upper-class segment of the intellectual elite, while strongly opposing religious union, drew its inspiration not only from reaffirmation of the roots of the Greek church but, notably, also reemphasis on, and more intensive and systematic study of, ancient Greek literature, philosophy, and even science. This reaching back to Byzantium's past roots in ancient Greek culture, the works of which were now in the Palaeologan Renaissance used in a more creative manner than before, allows us to call this group, in modern terminology, a "revitalization movement."

Finally, a fourth (the smallest) group, also of the intellectual elite, saw considerable virtue even in Latin culture and Western forms of worship, thereby going beyond supporting religious union simply for political reasons. This group, unafraid of union, was able to



perceive clearly in certain aspects of medieval Latin culture, especially in Thomistic theology and philosophy, its Greek, Aristotelian roots. So impressed were they by what they considered this more constructive Western use of Greek classical learning, compared to what seemed the more static, traditional Byzantine interpretation of this ancient Greek legacy, that many of the group espoused the Latin faith from genuine religious and intellectual conviction.

Of all the upper-class intellectual groups mentioned, those characterized by anti-Latin feeling sometimes (though not always) supported the Hesychast movement, the ascetic, contemplative practices of which often came to be identified with a sense of Greek ethnicity or "nationalism"—a feeling exacerbated, perhaps, by the West's out-of-hand rejection of Hesychasm and Palamism as doctrinally innovative and therefore heretical. Other Greek anti-Latin intellectuals, however, vigorously opposed the views of Hesychasm as not being consistent with traditional Byzantine theology. As for the Byzantine Latinophile groups (drawn from the prelates and bureaucracy as well as a few of the upper middle class), they saw in religious union with Rome not only the best solution to the Turkish peril but, more important, were able to distinguish the classical Greek elements at the roots of Western Scholasticism and thus to regard it, in effect, as a "revitalization" of ancient Greek learning—the latter, of course, a very significant component of their own cultural inheritance.

The differing responses on the part of the various strata of Byzantine society to what seemed basically an ineluctable choice between Turkish conquest or religious and, ultimately, cultural assimilation by the Latins, are very difficult to categorize with regard to the specific social classes, since in many cases views overlapped. It is far easier to cite the names of individual leaders of the anti-Latin or pro-Latin groups: for instance, the aristocratic Lucas Notaras, who was grand duke (and supposedly said, "Better the turban of the Turk in Constantinople than the tiara of the pope");<sup>22</sup> the intransigent antiunionist Mark of Ephesus, who was a monk of probable Hesychast, if not Palamite, views; the Thomistic yet later violently antiunionist scholar and judge, George Scholarios, who came from the middle class and was to become the first patriarch under the Turks; the opponent of union (as well as of Hesychasm), the anti-Latin Nicephorus Gregoras, who played an important part in the Palaeologan intellectual Renaissance; and, finally, the high church dignitary John Bessarion, a leading prounionist and admirer of Latin culture who



held the archbishopric of Nicaea.<sup>23</sup> Although class distinctions with respect to these various views were often unclear, it may be said in general that virtually all sectors of the Byzantine populace belonged to one or the other of two major camps—those who because of apprehension over Latinization and loss of "national" identity feared the Latins more and the Turks less, and those (this camp was far smaller) who feared the barbaric Turks more and the culturally kindred Latins less.

With the Byzantine social and political structure breaking down, it is certain that Byzantines of widely different classes shared the view that their best hope for survival as a people lay in the careful and meticulous preservation of the traditional Greek religion and culture. The growing hostility between East and West, nurtured for long centuries and exploding into the open in 1204, had become too deep to be overcome even in so fatal a crisis for Christendom as the imminent Turkish conquest of Constantinople. By the last two centuries of Byzantium's existence, the vast majority of Greeks had in fact become almost paranoid about even the symbol of things Latin. And this near-paranoia seems in the final analysis to have been based on the fear—perhaps subconscious, perhaps in part even irrational—ultimately of complete or nearly complete cultural absorption. To put it in modern terms, what the Byzantines seemed most apprehensive about was the imminent possibility of the disappearance, through "assimilation," of an identifiable Greek culture which could guarantee continuity of life and a distinct historical existence.<sup>24</sup>

And yet a few learned—one might venture to say enlightened—Greeks, such as the Latinophiles Grand Logothete Demetrius Cydones and later John Bessarion, were able to rise above the prejudices of centuries, to separate their ethnic feelings as "Greeks" from their religious convictions, and to accept what they envisioned as being the higher ideal of a larger, ecumenical community of Christendom in preference to what they considered the narrower view of their coreligionists.<sup>25</sup> But let the reader judge who was right, the adamant Byzantine antiunionist, Mark of Ephesus who, at the Council of Florence, rejected the *filioque* on doctrinal grounds and probably in the implicit conviction that it would ultimately lead to cultural as well as religious "Latinization," or his Byzantine opponent, the irenic prounionist Bessarion, who believed that, while accepting papal supremacy, his people could nonetheless maintain intact their revered Byzantine religious tradition and the legacy inherited from



their ancient forebears—Hellenic culture.<sup>26</sup> One prounionist near-contemporary of Bessarion, the post-Byzantine scholar Demetrius Ducas, was quite definite regarding the relative importance of the two elements, affirming that the Byzantine theological legacy from the Orthodox Church Fathers was of a higher order of importance than their intellectual inheritance from the ancient Greeks.<sup>27</sup> But he, it should be observed, was a scholar of the diaspora living *after* 1453 in the West.

The views of Bessarion are frequently misunderstood today. It is not, as many modern historians put it, that he was genuinely "pro-Latin" (the word *Latinophron* means "of Latin mind") and therefore anti-Greek. Rather, he believed that coexistence, even an amalgamation of cultures, was possible and that it was not necessary for one culture to obliterate the other. Indeed, shortly before Constantinople's fall in 1453, he, like his teacher, the Neoplatonist philosopher Gemistos Pletho, impressed by the advances in Latin technology and social organization, proposed that in order to revivify the remnants of the Byzantine state (in particular the Peloponnesus) young Greeks should be sent to the West to learn such useful industrial techniques as ironworking and shipbuilding.<sup>28</sup> Still Bessarion always continued to emphasize the significance of the Greek inheritance from *both* the ancients and the Greek Fathers.

By the time the interaction of the two societies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance came effectively to an end about 1600, ancient Greek letters had been successfully diffused throughout almost the entire Western world. And in this last major phase of the Western reception of classical Greek learning and Byzantium's creativity, the intellectual Byzantine exiles, though far from their homeland, played the major role.<sup>29</sup> It was a fitting climax to the many valuable Greco-Byzantine contributions to Western thought—a virtually unbroken process of acculturation extending from the "piecemeal" Byzantine contact with and filtering into Western culture in our lengthy first chronological phase, through the Greco-Latin social and cultural collisions and mutual borrowings of the second and third periods, to the more immediate and intensive Byzantine influence on the Italian Renaissance in the fourth and final period.

For now, to the medieval synthesis of Western culture—Roman Christianity, Latin learning, and the finally "domesticated" Germanic element—there was at last added perhaps the most inspirational influence of all, virtually the entire corpus of ancient Greek



learning in the original language. What served as the capstone to this entire phenomenon, as the concluding step in the long process of cultural interaction—despite long-ingrained Western suspicion of the Byzantine church—was the reception and printing, by "Christian humanists" of the Western Renaissance, not only of the seminal Eastern Church Fathers but even of some of the later *Byzantine* theological and mystical writings as well (see chap. 14).

What is truly ironic is that by 1600 a reversal of cultural roles had taken place. It was now the Greeks who, under the oppressive and stultifying Turkish occupation, had declined in civilization and were suffering from a cultural lag. Indeed, as we have seen, after 1453 Greece gradually became a cultural wasteland. Already in 1455 this was foreseen by Bessarion himself, when in his commission to his protégé, the Byzantine humanist Michael Apostolis, to gather up Greek manuscripts, he stated, not without prescience, that he felt it his duty to preserve the ancient heritage for the benefit not of himself but of future generations of Greeks, "who, otherwise, would differ in no way from barbarians and slaves." For, with the Turkish oppression in Greece and the closing of virtually all schools (with the exception of a few serving the patriarch), most Greek intellectuals were abandoning the East and bringing their learning to the West. As we have already observed in chapter 9, it was these very Greek exiles of the diaspora who would later play a significant (and hitherto unappreciated) role in the resurrection of the modern Greek nation.<sup>30</sup>

I realize that the tripartite typology of modes of acculturation as set forth in this book will not please all sociologists, especially those who are "terminologically" oriented. The most recent sociological research seems, rather, to point to theories of pluralism, that is, to the use of many typologies to explain sociocultural phenomena.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, while recognizing that what has been presented here constitutes only one possible macroscopic typology of acculturation, I hope that cultural historians and sociologists alike will find some value in the combination of chronology and modes of cultural influence which the Prologue and Epilogue have offered as a framework for the chapters explaining the long and complex interaction between the "sibling" Byzantine and Latin worlds. For, as is still rarely realized, it was the melding of the Germano-Latin, Christian synthesis on the one hand, together with ancient Greek learning (as pres-



served and transmitted by Byzantium) and strains of Eastern Orthodox religious creativity and tradition on the other, that constituted two of the primary components in the formative period of what came to be called "modern Western civilization."<sup>32</sup>



## Appendix:

### Latin Text of Chalcondyles' Discourses

*Folio 1<sup>v</sup>* Iste Grecus fuit Demetrius Atheniensis qui publice padue primo Erothimata deinde Hesiodum nobis exposuit.

Marsilius Ficinus in prohemio operum platonis de isto Demetrio mencionem facit eo modo.

Ne forte putes amice lector tantum opus editum temere, scito cum iam composuissem antequam ederem me censors huic operi pulures adhibuisse Demetrium Atheniensem non minus philosophia et eloquio quam genere Athicum Georgium Antonium, Joannem Baptistam, Florentinos viros latine lingue greceque peritissimos etc.

*Folio 2<sup>r</sup>* Oratio Greci, viri clarissimi habita in principio sue lecture:  
Anno domino MCCCCLXIII Padue Preambulum.

Et si ego de studiis litterarum Grecarum orationem neque rei dignitate neque auribus vestris dignam, Magnifice Rector, doctores celeberrimi ceterique viri eruditissimi, non me videam habere posse cum magnitudine rei tumque ego parum admodum in huiusmodi rebus exercitatus, parvo preterea ingenio et doctrina modica vobis doctissimis sapientissimisque viris nullo pacto satisfacere possem. Tamen quia rei novitas ac potissimum principiorum consuetudo hoc efflagitare videntur pingui (ut aiunt) Minerva hanc provinciam aggressus sum. Vos vero humanissimi ac sapientissimi viri cum in omnibus summan humanitatem atque mansuetudinem gerere consuevistis eandem ipsam vel mihi nullam homini novo et in litteris latinis mediocriter erudito prestare propicioque et ylari fronte meum

*Folio 2<sup>v</sup>* audire/ sermonem velitis. Cum igitur ab illustrissimo ac inclito venetorum dominio rogatu Reverendissimi domini mei Cardinalis sedisque Apostolici legati de latere favoreque et auxilio magnifici Rectoris et egregiorum scholarium, ut ergo litteras Grecas publice legerem constitutus sum, idcirco quantum utilitatis ornamenti perfectionisque studia litterarum latinis afferant quantumque illustraverint et illustrent, non ab re aliquid dicere visum est.

Aliud preambulum eiusdem Greci anno sequenti, videlicet MCCC-LXIII in studio paduano.



Hodiernum diem mihi iocundissimum simul et horrendum esse existimo. Iocundissimum quidem quod frequentia tanta virorum clarissimorum doctissimorumque mee orationi interesse dignati fuerint. Que si quoquo modo auribus vestris digna grataque fuerit, nihil mihi felicius, nihil suavius ac magis optabile esse profecto duxero. Horrendum vero quod ego tam parvo ingenio doctrina modica tamque tenui et exigua eloquencia mea apud viros ubique terrarum ingeniis sapientia omni genere doctrina et

*Folio 3<sup>r</sup>* eloquen/ tia celeberrimos prestantissimosve oracionem sum habiturus. Quis esset vel adeo eloquens adeoque ingenio periciaque valens, qui in conspectu vestro omni gravitate ac sapientia referto non obstupesceret, horreret hesitaretque. Verum cum ego animadverto vestram scienciam humanitatem et mansuetudinem erga omnes, haud dubitavi quod etiam in homine novo ac poenitus inconsueto parumque admodum in huiusmodi rebus exercitato et litteris latinis ne mediocriter erudito propicios vos prebueritis et benignos, tametsi sermo meus exilis nec dignus neque rei dignitate de qua aliqua dicere<sup>1</sup> animus est neque sapientia fuerit. Cum igitur ego ab illustrissimo et inclito dominio venetorum rogatu Reverendissimi domini mei Cardinalis et legati de latere favoreque auxilio voluntate et consensu insignis rectoris et egregiorum scolarium ut litteras grecas legerem publice constitutus sum, quantum utilitatis ornamenti perfeccionisque afferent quantumque litterarum grecarum studia latinarum litterarum illustraverunt illustrantque, non ab re dicere aliquid visum est. Quare velim, magnifici ac humanissimi viri, parumper animum<sup>2</sup> huc animadvertetis benignoque fronte ac hilarique pro consuetudine vestra sermonem/ meum<sup>3</sup> audire velitis.

*Folio 3<sup>v</sup>*

Incipit oratio Greci insignis habita in principio lecture in inclito gymnasio Patavino.

Nemini credo vestrum esse ignotum omne genus liberalium artium a grecis latinis accepisse et cum auctores omnium istarum arcium grecos et ipsa nomina artibus indicta greca fuisse constat. Nam ut ab ipsis infimis incipiam et ipsorum elementorum et grammaticae poesis oratoriae artis ac hystorie logice mathematicorum philosophiae naturalis medicine ac ipsius denique divinae science, quis idem mediocriter eruditus ignorat eos inventores fuisse, aut omnia aut aliqua ex his ab aliis accepta ipsos meliora perfectioraque reddidisse, at<sup>4</sup> postea latinis tradidisse. Qui adeo in omni genere virtutis doctrinaque viguere ut nemini ea tempestate qua florebant in nulla re cessisse compertum est. Hos latini ad unguem sequuti usque ad ipsa litterarum elementa merito antecelluisse ceteris gentibus tam in omni genere doctrine quam etiam in re militari existimantur.

*Folio 4<sup>r</sup>*

Cum itaque et studia litterarum et omnes artes ab/ eis ac-



cepissent<sup>5</sup> auctoresque ipsos sequuntur, nemo inficias ibit, quin studia litterarum grecarum plurimum fructus latinis in omni genere doctrine afferant. Et enim ut de iis in primis quae ad grammaticam attinent aliquid dicam, cum grammatica latina grece coniuncta est et ab ipsa dependere videtur, quomodo quisquam cognitionem plenam eius habere putaverit nisi litteras grecas noverit. Neque enim derivacionem complurium vocabulorum et significatus proprios neque declinacionem multorum nominum quantitatesque syllabarum scire aut denique recte ac eleganter loqui voluerit,<sup>6</sup> si eas ignoraret. Nec recte ut puto dici posset quod non nulli auctores latini aliqua documenta his rebus tradidissent, id circo non opus esset litteris grecis. Nam et illi ita de his loquuntur ut discentes cognitionem earum habeant, non ut prorsus ignorent. Ad hoc nequaquam ita perfecte ex his qui admodum tetigerint eo sicut ex ipso fonte (ut ita dicam) dicere possent, veluti si aliquis sitim suam explere cupiens non stagnum potius quam fontem peteret neque exuriens<sup>7</sup> belaria pro cibis solidis habere mallet. Pariter quoque dicendum censeo/

Folio 4<sup>v</sup>

de his que ad poetas atque artem oratoriam et omne genus dicendi spectare videantur, cum neque poema neque oracionem sine nominibus atque recta loquutione figuris coloribus argumentisque aliquis confici posse existimaret. Cumque ars utriusque abunde et copiose ab his tradita et in eorum poematibus ac orationibus ac hystoriis quam plene perfecteque digesta sit, confirmant sententiam meam veteres auctores latini tam poete quam oratores et qui historias conscripsere. Quorum nullum ignarum litterarum grecarum fuisse constat. Quin complures eorum adeo bene pleneque eas venerasse, ut dubium esset an litteras grecas vel latinas melius scirent. Fertur M. Ciceronem in greca optime grece orasse, et inscriptis suis ipsemet fatetur greca latinis semper ad utilitatem suam coniunxisse. Nullamque differentiam inter cognitionem lingue<sup>8</sup> latine et grece facere, quemadmodum vos me longe melius hec scire potestis. Brutumque epistolas graece scriptas elegantissime gravissimas sentenciosissimasque posteris reliquisse constat. Favorinum preterea virum latinum ut Philostratus in libro suo quem de vitis sophistarum edidit egregium oratorem extitisse

Folio 5<sup>r</sup>

testatur, multos adeo alios, quorum nomina recensere longum esset, peritos<sup>9</sup> admodum litterarum graecarum videri evasisse. Non igitur illi viri doctissimi tantam operam hiis litteris im-

Folio 5<sup>v</sup>



pendissent, nisi magnum fructum inde posse, capere sese existimassent magnoque adiumento et ornamento eas litteras latinis suisque operibus esse perspicerent. Ut etiam ex sententia Oratii poete gravissimi atque optimi aperte animadverti potest qui sic de graecis loquitur. "Graeis ingenium, Graeis dedit ore rotundo musa loqui."<sup>10</sup> Et alibi hortando latinos ad haec studia admonet: "Vos exemplaria greca nocturna versate manu, versate diurna."<sup>11</sup> Quid dicam de ipsa philosophia in qua et si nullum alium ex hiis studiis fructum aliquis capere posset,<sup>12</sup> tamen ob ipsos textus Aristotelis qui in latinam linguam satis male inepteque conversi sunt, ut eos plenius rectiusque intelligerent, in proprio fonte philosophie potissimum incumbentes has litteras discere debent. Omitto dicere quantum etiam succi et fructus in hac philosophia copiose ex aliis voluminibus grecis capere quantumve melius pleniusque sententias aliorum philosophorum atque opiniones ex ipsis grecis autoribus intelligere possent. Quas modo veluti sub umbra videre tenebre videntur.<sup>13</sup> Itidem de medicina et astrologia ceterisque artibus dicere possem, quum/ et omnium istarum<sup>14</sup> auctores greci fuisse asserant cumque plura ut arbitror in hiis scientiis sint, quae nisi quis has litteras teneat hadud facile intelligere posset. Quare egregii et eruditi adolescentes qui virtutibus liberalibusque artibus operam impensius datis, exemplis veterum auctorum vestrorum multisque rationibus ducti velitis cunctis viribus his incumbere litteris fructumque ex his iocundum animum alentem consequi, quod si prompto alacriorique animo feceritis, scietis profecto me recte vobis consuluisse. Nec vos post hec (ni fallor) magis poenitebit incoepti quam pigebit quod tardiuscule has litteras discere inceperitis. Nec preterea magnam difficultatem, ut forte existimabatis, in hiis discendis habebitis, cum haud parvam conformitatem et propinquitatem cum litteris latinis habere videantur. Quas etsi difficiles cognitu quoque modo aliquis existimaret, tamen propter spem fructus et utilitatis ex hiis habende<sup>15</sup> nullum laborem aut aliquam arduum vitam re debetis. Illud presertim considerantes quod nulla res in se virtutis aliquid habens sine labore difficultateque comparari potest ut et Hesiodus ait poeta.

APETHΣ ΔΡΩΣΑΤΕ ἀπο πεδεν ἔθασκα τὴν  
μεν τι κακο τῆς ἡκε κηνις συνελεθα<sup>16</sup>

quos versus sic aliquis interpretari posset: "virtuti multum superi junxere sudorem."



Aretis drosathe apro peden ethaska tin men ti kako tis ike *λένεις*  
sneletha.

*Folio 6<sup>r</sup>*

Quis simul et vitium quamquam sibi sumere potest." Ego vero qui vos his litteris deo dante instructurus sum, etsi non cognosco me eam habere doctrinam, ut alciora ac magis ardua vos doceam, tamen omnibus viribus evitar in hiis principiis gramatice et in poetis ac oratoribus vobis satisfacere, viamque quoad possum breviorum melioremque in adipiscendis his litteris patefacere, denique omnem meam operam ac studium prestiturum me in hiis vobis polliceor. Superest ut animum vestrum hiis studiis intendatis solerciaque vestra ac vigilancia me prompciolem alacrioremque in docendo vos efficiatis. De hac autem lectura que denuo<sup>17</sup> huic celebri universitati adiuncta est ad honorem amplificationem utilitamque eius vos et ego una ingentes in primis ac immortales<sup>18</sup> gracias illustrissimo et inclito dominio venetorum. Quod sua liberalitate de hac lectura rogatum facile concesserat habere debemus. Deinde Reverendissimo domino Cardinali ac Patriarche<sup>19</sup> Constantinopolitano sedisque apostolice legato de latere et meo singularissimo domino. Qui cum doctissimus in utraque lingua atque sapientissimus sit intelligatque quantum fructus hec littere afferant exhibeant<sup>20</sup> pariant quam primum voluntatem universitatis accepit

*Folio 6<sup>v</sup>*

omni mora sublata haud quaquam rogare Illustrissimum/ dominium ac simul impetrare neglexit, quod deus omnipotens una cum ipso incolume<sup>21</sup> atque fortunatum<sup>22</sup> semper conservet<sup>23</sup> cum ob eorum in se observacionem et pietatem, tum ob optimam voluntatem et animum quem gerunt adversus teterrimos immanissimos atque impios barbaros thurcos pro fide ac utilitate omnium christianorum ac pro recuperacione grece misere quae crudelissime ab illis subacta oppressaque supplex auxilium implorat omnium christianorum et maxime latinorum abhiisque hanc remunerationem exposcit. Ut quemadmodum<sup>24</sup> ipsa omnes res suas preciosissimas atque prestantissimas liberaliter et absque aliqua parsimonia iis erogaverat suaque manu ac virtute armorum Italiam olim a Gothis oppressam in suum statum restituerat. Ita nunc iacentem atque afflictam<sup>25</sup> elevare et armis a manibus barbarorum liberare velint. Quod potissimum sese impetraturam<sup>26</sup> ab illustrissimo venetorum dominio per cuius potenciam et voluntatem sanctissimam et piissimam ab infidelibus liberata Deo propicio et auxiliante et in pristinum statum redacta immortales ei gracias pro tali beneficio



perpetuo aget, idque non secus ad salutem suam apparuisse existimabit ac illi<sup>27</sup> qui a malo ut<sup>28</sup> in inferno Dantis<sup>29</sup> Christum pro sua liberatione in infernum descendisse viderant.

*Folio 7r*

Hec in conspectu vestri pro parvitate doctrine/ingenii mei dixisse volui, non ut<sup>30</sup> vos deceam aut quia vos haec ignorare existimo, sed ut consuetudinem in huiusmodi principiis servare,<sup>31</sup> meumque officium ad haec studia iuvenes hortandi haud pretermisisse viderer. Vos vero etsi ego nihil dignum neque expectatione neque dignitate vestra fecerim, tamen pro humanitate ac consuetudine vestra veniam dabit mihi qui variis casibus ac infortuniis agitatus neque mediocrem quidem doctrinam adeptus sum neque, si vel longe maiorem doctrinam magisque ingenium valens<sup>32</sup> haberem, existimarem me unquam tantis viris satisfacere posse. Graciasque quas possum vobis quod me adeo benigne ac perhumane viri tante sapientie ac dignitatis audire volueritis.

Finis Orationis prime viri prestantissimi Greci.

*Folio 7v* Oratio Secunda Greci Initio Studii habita Padue. Anno domini die x Novembris MCCCCLXXIII<sup>33</sup>

Vellem Magnifice Rector, Doctores celeberrimi ceterique viri ornatissimi, ut mihi ingenii vires essent eaque doctrina simul et eloquentia, ut aliqua de litterarum grecarum studiis, que hiis congrua, vestra vero expectatione digna essent dicere possem hoc enim modo et eorum dignitas studiorum atque utilitas satis explanari posset et sapientiis vestris quodammodo satisfactum putarem. Sed cum exile ingenium, exiguum doctrinam tenuem admodum eloquentiam in me esse perspiciam, vereor ne in dicendo vobis viris gravissimis ac in eius<sup>34</sup> scientiarum genere peritissimis ineptus esse videar, ut ne deterius quam rei causa postulet dicam. Verum cum considero quam vos humanos quamque benignos omnibus hic dicere solitis prebere consuevistis, quod tantum benignitatis unicuique tribuitis, quantum et ingenium et facultas cuiusque exposcere videtur. Fruens et ego humanitate

*Folio 8r*

vestra, non mea eruditione, aliqua dicenda de hiis/studiis censui, cum presertim consuetudinem in hiis principiis longam tempore observatam et approbatam vel me sequi oporteat. Ut igitur hic initium faciam, litterarum grecarum studia magne utilitati et ornameto in primis generi humano fuisse neminemque aliqua litterarum disciplina imbutum ignorare existimo. Quis enim esset tam expertus tamque rudis liberalium artium qui omne<sup>35</sup> scientiarum genus maxime apud graecos vixisse et excultum fuisse nesciret? Nam qui auctores omnium ferme scientiarum atque cultores fuere? Quantique eos omnes terrarum nationes faciant, quanta veneratione prose-



quantur facile quisque animadvertere potest. Que nisi<sup>36</sup> de hiis litteris eruditi fuissent, numquam (ni fallor) perfeccionem scientiarum attigisse valuissent, quippe ubi in hiis litteris fundamenta et principia scientiarum omnium iacta eaque discussa ac digesta poenitus sint. Quanto homines doctiores peritioresque in hiis scienciis erant, tanto magis harum studio litterarum flagrabant. Quod quidem Romani qui non minus forte in liberalibus artibus quam in armis superiori tempore claruere plane demonstrant. Nam hii omnes ferme non minus linguam profram quam grecam callebant affectusque animi ac rerum

Folio 8<sup>v</sup>

vim et naturam grecis nominibus magis quam latinis aptius exprimere malebant. Volumina enim pene omnium dignissimorum auctorum dictionibus atque sententiis grecis referta hoc indicare nemo<sup>37</sup> ut puto animum advertens ambigeret, nec solum hunc fructum ex litteris grecis consequi posse, verum etiam pleniorum cognitionem proprie lingue<sup>38</sup> inde habere perspexerunt, cum latinam eloquucionem ex greca originem traxisse eamque veluti parentem habuisse nullus<sup>39</sup> illorum inscius esset. Quid dicam de viris in quavis facultate peritis, qui aliquid in sua quisque arte componere atque in lucem producere vellent? Quantum fructum quantamve ubertatem a fontibus grecorum, ut divus Cicero clamat, haurire possent. Que quidem cum unusquisque animo revolvere possit exempla tam dignissima illorum clarorum priscorum pre oculis habeamus, satis profecto admirari nequeo, cur tanta ignavia tantaque desidia hii omnes obstiti sunt, ut harum litterarum studia poenitus negligant. Quod si indocti imperitique litterarum bonarum facerent nec artibus liberalibus delectarentur aut ingenium extollere nollent, non utique mirum videretur. Huiusmodi namque homines haud facile adherere litterarum studiis amant. Quin eis cuncta studia oneri maximo esse videntur, nec ea secus abhorrent

Folio 9<sup>r</sup>

ac frenesi capti peritos medicos aut quoscumque alios sue saluti consulere volentes. Sed cum homines eruditos atque doctos hoc facere video, in admirationem sane maximam ducor. Nam per deos immortales cum haec littere et cognitionem et finem (?) pleniorum ac<sup>40</sup> certe firmiorem et fructum in omnibus scientiis non mediocrem afferre possint, adde etiam ornamentum et copiam et plurium rerum atque hystoriarum, quid est quod ab hiis studiis amovere faciat? Scilicet<sup>41</sup> labor ne et rei difficultas, an locorum maxi-

Folio

Folio 1



ma intervalla? at turpe est viris virtute peditis atque peritis aliquid bonum virtutemque<sup>42</sup> propter horum aliquid fugere velle. Nam etsi nulla alia re, exemplis tum illorum antiquorum ac clarissimorum virorum, quos recensui<sup>43</sup> tam latinos quam grecos, ad hoc incitari<sup>44</sup> debemus, qui discendi causa nullo labore, nullo periculo perterriti totum pene peragraverunt orbem. Romani etiam qui terre marisque domini extitere docti preterea domique ludis omnium ferme scientiarum existentibus suos liberos Athenas mittere consueverunt. Vos vero qui non magnum laborem, neque longam peregrinationem horum causa studiorum subire opus sit, adhuc arripere negligitis, adhuc hesitatis? Barbaris hec ignavia, barbaris inquam omnium bonarum artium inexpertis hec inertiam permittatur.<sup>45</sup> Nec mihi velim hoc arroganter dictum aut/ de me ipso haec dicere me existimaretis. Non enim tantam mihi arrogo provinciam nec adeo elatus sum ut me ipsum aliquantulum non cognoscere valeam. Sed hec ideo dixi ut ostenderem illos priscos ac pene divinos viros nullum laborem, nullum tam longissimum intervallum locorum virtutis causa declinasse. Nos tantum distare ab illis videmur, ut que illi procul a suis patriis posita atque inventa omnibus viribus enixi sunt capere, nos interdum prope<sup>46</sup> admodum locata reicere atque contemnere videmur. Nec preterea res ita ardua est, ut quivis his litteris incumbere volens brevi multum proficere non possit. Quippe que tantam convenientiam tantamque (ut ita dicam) necessitudinem cum latinis habeant, ut qui alteras sciat facillime alteras consequatur. Quod etiam multis experienciis compertum habemus. Nam cum nonnulli viri externi has litteras discere voluerunt, qui magis ab hiis alieni videntur, brevi admodum spacio temporis non parum in hiis litteris proficere. Quamobrem vos adolescentes, qui in florentissima estis etate, in qua multa discre potestis, quisque omni genere disciplinarum flagrat, agite et haec studia cum vestris coniungite et vestros maiores in hoc imitari velitis, fructumque ex hiis litteris vobis oblatum alacri accipite animo. Me enim in hiis tradendis<sup>47</sup> litteris promptissimum ut vobis libuerit semper invenietis, et ingeniolum meum quantumcumque sit ac doctrinam litterarum istarum et omnes denique vires intus que sint libentissime impendere pro certo habetote quo<sup>48</sup> vos eruditos in hiis studiis litterarum efficiam brevique harum cognitionem forte non medicorem tradam. Et pro beneficio quod mihi haec preclara universitas contulit cuius consensu

Folio 9<sup>o</sup>Folio 10<sup>r</sup>



et rogatu, ac intercessione serenissimi domini mei singularis-  
simi ac sapientissimi Cardinalis Niceni ab Illustrissimo ac  
munificentissimo Dominio venetorum lecturam istam obtinui  
hanc remunerationem et gratiam plenissime pro viribus  
reddam. Tibi vero Magnifice ac humanissime Rector cui  
me ob tuas singulares virtutes tuamque precipuam doctri-  
nam<sup>49</sup> devinctum semper fatebor vobisque doctores sapientis-  
simi et reliquis in me<sup>50</sup> benignitatem ac et studium pro im-  
petratione huius mee lecture viris cum virtute ac doctrina  
praeditis quas possum, non quas debeo gratias ago quod  
me tam benigne

*Folio 10<sup>v</sup>* tamque equo ani/ mo audire dignati estis.

### ΤΕΛΟΣ

Finiunt foeliciter Orationes Desiderii<sup>51</sup> viri clarissimi Greci preceptoris  
mei in studio paduano ac principio sue lecture lepidissime recitate.

Scripsi ego Hartmannus Schedel de Nuremberga artium ac medicine  
doctor Patavinus, in primordio studii de manu prefati Greci dum initia  
litterarum grecarum edocuit.

### Laus Deo

### Notes to Appendix

1. diceret, *cod.*    2. animum, *cod.*    3. aliter orationem meum, *suprascriptit cod.*
4. *malim et.*    5. (accep)erint, *supram cod.*    6. *malim* posset.    7. i.e. *esuriens.*    8.
- ligue *cod.*    9. peritis *cod.*    10. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 323–24.    11. *Ibid.*, 268–69.
12. arbitretur, *in margine add. cod.*    13. sine, *cod.*, tenere, *cod.*, vident, *cod.*    14.
- istorum, *cod.*    15. habunde, *cod.*    16. The Greek original from Hesiod is doubtless  
the following line: τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκον ἀθάνατοι. (*Works  
and Days*, Loeb ed., 1. 289). For those unfamiliar with Greek, Schedel inserts at the  
bottom of this page a Latin transliteration of Hesiod.    17. de novo, *in margine.*    18.
- mortales, *cod.*    19. Patriarcha, *cod.*    20. exhibent, *cod.*    21. incolumis, *cod.*    22.
- fortunatis, *cod.*    23. conservat, *cod.*    24. liberalissime, *in margine.*    25. afflictam,  
*cod.*    26. *in margine*, consequuturam (*lec. var. pro impetraturam*).    27. illo, *cod.*
28. vi, *cod.*    29. Danti, *cod.*    30. ut, *addidi.*    31. *in margine*, sequi (*lec. var. pro  
servare*).    32. *in margine*, pollens.    33. 1464? *in margine, recente manu.*    34. *malim*
- cuiusmodi.    35. omnium, *cod.*    36. nihi, *cod.*    37. venio, *cod.*    38. ligue, *cod.*
39. nullius, *cod.*    40. at, *cod.*    41. labor scilicet, *cod.*    42. virtuteque, *cod.*    43.
- recensere, *cod.*    44. incitare, *cod.*    45. omittatur, *cod.*    46. proprie, *cod.*    47.
- tratraddendis, *cod.*    48. ut, *supram cod.*    49. doctrinam *addidi.*    50. *malim* propter.
51. Desiderii, *cod.* (*malim* Demetrii). Desiderii was added later, in another hand.



## Notes

### Notes to Prologue

1. No studies, to my knowledge, have focused primarily on the problem of the interaction or "acculturation" of the Byzantine and Latin societies through their long history of relations. In the Prologue and Epilogue, *acculturation* is taken to mean not only the interaction of the two cultures discussed but particularly the influence or rejection of elements or aspects of either culture on the part of the other, emphasizing attitudes of receptivity and repulsion. *Acculturation*, for sociologists, does not refer only to culture in the narrow sense (art, literature, theology) but, even more importantly, is concerned with the general ethos or "ambience" of society. R. Linton, "The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation" in D. Walker, *The Emergent Native Americans* (Boston, 1972), p. 6, gives this definition: "[Acculturation] comprehends the phenomena resulting when groups of individuals with different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture pattern of either or both groups." Given the lack of sociological studies (so I am told by several sociologists) on two equally advanced societies (as the Byzantine and Western after some centuries became), I have here formulated my own criteria, that is, my own typology for outlining the process of Byzantine-Latin acculturation.

Sociological works of a general nature which have been of help to me in one way or another are the following: W. Newman, *American Pluralism: Attitudes of Minority Groups and Social Theory* (New York, 1973); B. Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Cultural Change* (New Haven, 1961), which emphasizes the agents of cultural change, especially the role of missionaries; M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York, 1964), exclusively on America; C. Geertz, *Islam Observed* (New York, 1968), on religion and cultural change; R. Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion* (Glencoe, Ill., 1957); C. Darlington, *The Evolution of Man and Society* (New York, 1969), esp. pp. 371-80 which stress especially the power of the state and the role of the eunuchs in the earlier Byzantine government; S. Lipset, *The Radical Right* (New York, 1969), who uses the term "nativistic reaction"; R. Nichols and G. Adams, eds., *American Indian: Past and Present* (Waltham, Mass, 1971), esp. the chapter by R. Berkhofer, "Protestants, Pagans, and Sequences, 1760-1860," on the acculturation of the Indian to Protestant ideals; the old but still useful works of L. Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf, Soziologische untersuchungen* (Innsbruck, 1883) and G. Ratzenhofer, *Soziologie. Positiv Lehre . . .* (Leipzig, 1907); C. Russett, *The Concept of Equilibrium in American Social Thought* (New Haven-London, 1966); R. Park, *Race and Culture* (New York, 1970) concentrating on Blacks in America and problems of the mulatto—which might also shed



light on those of the Byzantine, half-breed Gasmule; W. Connolly, *The Bias of Pluralism* (New York, 1969); A. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*; J. Wach, *Sociology of Religion* (Chicago, 1971); several works of G. von Grönebaum, including *Medieval Islam: A Study in Cultural Orientation* (Chicago, 1946) and his *Modern Islam: The Search for Cultural Identity* (Berkeley, 1962).

Socio-historical studies that have hitherto been done on Byzantium have primarily dealt with the following basic problems: (1) the decline and collapse of central authority in the empire: see the articles of Charanis, Ostrogorsky, and Diehl included in S. Eisenstadt, *The Decline of Empires* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967); (2) problems of the social structure of the empire (e.g. see P. Charanis, "The Aristocracy in Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century," ed. P. Coleman-Norton, *Studies in Roman Economic and Sociological History* (Princeton, 1951); (3) problems of land tenure and central authority (i.e. "feudalism"): see G. Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels, 1954); and A. Kazdan, *Drevnja i gorod v Vizantii IX-X vv* (Moscow, 1960); (4) urban problems in Constantinople, e.g. D. Miller, *Imperial Constantinople* (New York, 1969); Kazdan, *idem*; and T. Rice, *Everyday Life in Byzantium* (London-New York, 1967), essentially concerned with Constantinople.

On Byzantine culture in general very few works of *synthesis* have appeared, notably the recent work of H. Haussig, *History of Byzantine Civilization*, trans. J. Hussey (London, rpt. 1971); the earlier work of S. Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization* (New York, 1933; rpt. 1959); H. Hunger, *Der Christliche Geist der Byzantinischen Kultur* (Graz, Austria, 1965); A. Kazdan, *Byzantijskaya Kultura* (Moscow, 1968); and K. Wessel, *Die Kultur von Byzanz* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1970) but without footnotes. The *New Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 4, pt. 2 (1967) is a collection of essays on Byzantine government, church, and civilization. Special mention should be made of D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (New York, 1971), esp. chap. 9, on factors of cultural diffusion, which deals with Byzantine-Slavic relations, with observations on Slavic attitudes toward Byzantine culture. See, finally, A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World* (London, 1973) esp. pp. 510 ff. For specific references to works cited here as well as others, sociological or cultural (e.g. on Byzantine-Latin ecclesiastical, political, literary, or artistic relations), see notes below to the Prologue, Epilogue, and the individual chapters of this book. Also see Bibliography.

2. On "nativistic movements" or reactions, see e.g. R. Linton, "The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation," pp. 7 ff., and Prologue, below, n. 34. Also S. Lipset, *Radical Right* (New York, 1969), and W. Newman, *American Pluralism: A Study of Minority Groups and Social Theory* (New York, 1973). Other scholars also use the term, sometimes slightly differently. Cf. also A. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956): esp. 267, 278.
3. See the recent article of D. Jacoby, "The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade," *American Historical Review* (1973), esp. pp. 891 and 903 ff., who perhaps makes the first attempt to analyze systematically from a sociological



and a historical viewpoint, the problem of social interaction between Byzantines and Latins in a given period and a definite area (the Morea, particularly between the Frankish conquerors and the subjugated Byzantine populace). One of his remarks is especially pertinent here: "Further study of the Byzantine-Latin encounter in the Peloponnesus might enable us to discover the mental patterns underlying the attitudes and behavior of individuals, and especially of social classes and societies reacting to each other in conquered areas." This remark expresses a basic aim of the Prologue and Epilogue of this book.

4. On the sense of community in Christendom, see below, esp. chaps. 2, 4, 6, 8. On the principal ecumenical-minded Greeks of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Cydones and Bessarion, see chap. 4, also Epilogue; and on Maximos the Confessor of the seventh century, see chap. 6.
5. On Byzantine Christianity see esp. chap. 1 and passim.
6. On "contact situations," esp. helpful has been the article of R. Berkhofer, "Protestants, Pagans, and Sequences, 1760-1860," ed. R. Nichols and G. Adams, *American Indian: Past and Present* (Waltham, Mass., 1971). See also R. Linton, "The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation," in D. Walker, ed., *The Emergent Native Americans* (Boston, 1972), p. 69 and passim.
7. On all these, see below, chaps. 3, 4, and 13. Also on Chrysoloras, see D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 26 ff. (reprinted as *Byzantium and the Renaissance* [Hamden, Conn., 1972]).
8. These contact situations have never been delineated systematically and in detail.
9. This is not to minimize the importance of the Oriental tradition, largely Semitic. On this, see the beginning of chap. 3.
10. See chap. 9.
11. Cf. chap. 4 on this, and R. Southern, *Making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1953), pp. 210, 220, who says that Latin scholars first reflected on their past "comfortably" ca. 1230.
12. Including esp. chaps. 4, 7, and 13.
13. See below, esp. chap. 3, n. 17, and J. Hussey, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire* (New York, 1963, reissued), esp. p. 203.
14. For an attempt to trace the growing religious schism between East and West, see D. Geanakoplos, "Edward Gibbon and Byzantine Ecclesiastical History," *Church History* 35 (1966):1-14. Cf. also D. Nicol, "The Byzantine View of Western Europe," *Greek, Roman, Byzantine Studies*, vol. 8 (1967).
15. On the famous problem of the "two emperors," see below, chap. 3, and (from the extensive literature) W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim, 1947). Also, my *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom* (Oxford, 1966), p. 19, with bibliography; W. Ohnsorge, *Worlds of Christendom* (Oxford, 1966), p. 19, with bibliography; W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt, 1958), esp. pp. 1 ff., 64 ff., 79 ff.; and G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1969), passim.
16. The armies were, of course, soon followed by other Latins—merchants, priests, colonists, etc. Obviously, the Crusader army did not fully represent Western culture.
17. See Robert of Clari, *La conquista di Costantinopoli*, critical study, translation,



and notes by A. Nada Patrone (Genova, 1972). That twenty years before this not all Latin civilians hated the Greeks, seems evident in William of Tyre, who says some Latins would not join in the slaughter of Greeks in 1182 "because they were Christians." See R. Davis, "William of Tyre," *Relations between East and West* . . . ed. D. Baker (Edinburgh, 1973), p. 76.

18. See my two chapters, "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," in K. Setton, ed., *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 3 (Madison, Wis., 1975), pp. 30-31.
19. On the Gasmules, see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 127, 132. Cf. D. Nicol, "Mixed Marriages in Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century," *Studies in Church History*, vol. 1, (1965) and H. Haussig, *A History of Byzantine Civilization* (London, 1966), pp. 361, 369. The Gasmules were able to pass as either Greeks or Latins, though in most cases they preferred to be Latins (who in later centuries became superior to the Greeks militarily and often socially).
20. On all these phenomena, see below, esp. chaps. 3 and 4.
- 20a. See papal documents (dated 1205, 1248, in H. Wieruszowski, *The Medieval University* [New York, 1966], pp. 144, 153-54), who believes nothing came of the plan except perhaps the establishment of a college in Paris called "of Constantinople." Whether it ever educated Greek youths in Latin and in the ritual of the Roman church is, according to Wieruszowski, unknown. Yet the main purpose, as noted and as the 1205 document reads, was "to propagate the Christian religion in the East."
21. See Choniates' quotation in R. Jenkins, *The Imperial Centuries* (New York, 1966), p. 383; for Cinnamos, cf. R. Lopez, "Foreigners in Byzantium," *Bulletin de l'institut historique belge de Rome* 44 (1974): 350.
- 21a. On the term *Latinization*, see next note and esp. Epilogue and chap. 2. On the problem of union and the council, see chaps. 8 and 11. Also my chapters "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," *ibid.*, pp. 90-92, and D. Nicol, "Byzantine Requests for an Oecumenical Council in the Fourteenth Century," *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969): 69-95.
22. On the Greek fear of Latinization, see below, esp. chaps. 2, 3, 4, and 8. Also, my *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, esp. pp. 270-72, 315-16; my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, pp. 2-3, 103, and esp. pp. 106 and 18, on Latin practices imposed on the Greek church after 1204. Important for the question of Latinization is Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation 1204-61* (New Brunswick, 1970) who fully appreciates the implications of this fear on the part of the Byzantines. This Greek fear, or deep apprehension, is often not understood or is minimized by Western historians (J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* [Cambridge, 1969], for example). But cf. Y. Congar, *After Nine Hundred Years* (New York, 1959), pp. 29-48, who perhaps best of all Western, non-Orthodox church historians understands this phenomenon. See also I. Sevcenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* (1955), p. 295, who correctly maintains that Greek insistence on what were called "trifles" by the Latins (the patriarch's allusion to the pope at Florence as "brother," the Greek refusal to uncover their heads before the papal legate, etc.) were "not trifles at all but reflected Greek cultural and ethnic pride."



23. See below, esp. chap. 4.
24. On Cydones see below, esp. chap. 4, which cites the article of R. Loenertz, "Lettre de Demetrius Cydonès à Andronic Oeneote . . .," *Revue des études byzantines* (1971), pp. 303-05. Also on Bessarion, see chap. 4 and "The Council of Florence and the Union between the Greek and Latin Churches," in my *Byzantine East and Latin West* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 100, 106, 112, 115, etc., with bibliography. Also Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, esp. pp. 241-45.
25. For an example of the common use of this Byzantine religious and ecclesiastical term *patroparadoton*, see my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 106, n. 86, which cites Greek use of the term at Florence supporting Byzantine use of the "enzymes" in the ritual and objecting to the Latin azymes. Cf. *Acta Graeca*, ed. J. Gill (Rome, 1953), p. 446 (Mansi, *Concilia*, 31a, col. 1012) for a similar use of the term.
26. I. Dujčev, "Le Patriarche Nil et les invasions turques vers la fin du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Mel. Arch. et d'hist.* 88 (1966): 213.
27. See Guillaume d'Adam, *Directorium ad passagium faciendum* (wrongly attributed to Brocardus), printed in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Documents Arméniens*, 2 (1906): 367 ff. (cf. my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 2, n. 3); see also Sevčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* (1955), p. 293.
28. Dubois, *De Recuperatione terre sancte*, ed. V. Langlois, in *Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude de l'histoire* (Paris, 1891), chap. 6, pp. 51-52.
29. The letter (which has been apparently unused in this connection) is printed in L. Mehus, *Epistolae . . . S. Ambrogii Traversari* (Florence, 1759), 1:26. (On Traversari, see below chap. 14.) Cf. many other such plans to "Catholicize" (the Greeks would have said to "Latinize") them. See above, text and n. 20a.
30. See my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 106, quoting N. Kalogeras, *Mark Eugenikos and Cardinal Bessarion* (Athens, 1893; in Greek), p. 70. Also, my "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," in K. Setton, ed., *A History of the Crusades* (Madison, Wis., 1975). Cf. a little later the (supposed) advice of Lucas Notaras, the Byzantine "prime minister," to disavow the Union of Florence on the grounds that the "Latin armies of King Ladislas of Hungary were more interested in conquering Byzantine lands than aiding the Greeks against the Turks" (Sevčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions," see n. 27).
31. See A. Demetrakopoulos, *Historia Schismatis* (Leipzig, 1867; in Greek) and his *Graecia Orthodoxa* (1872; in Greek), p. 168 (as quoted in my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 106, n. 84). A curious passage in the fifteenth-century Byzantine historian Sphrantzes (Bonn ed.), pp. 418 ff., written to the tutor of the children of the last representative of the Byzantine imperial family, instructs them to live in all respects as Latins, wearing Latin clothing, attending Latin churches, and even praying in the Latin manner. Cf., finally, my Epilogue to this book on Bessarion and his attitudes.
32. For an interesting discussion by a Byzantine and a Latin cleric (an "azymista," as the Greeks said), see A. Vassilief, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina* (Moscow, 1893), pp. 179-88 (cf. Pachymeres [Bonn] 1: 491-92). This colloquy con-



stitutes chap. 8 of this book. For other Greek epithets directed against the Latins, and on the well-known Latin accusation of Greek "perfidy" and Greek "schismatics," see esp. chap. 2; also, my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, pp. 2-3 and 5 (see, for example, the account of Odo of Deuil, the twelfth-century crusader-chaplain of the French king, who calls the Byzantines "perfidious" and "inferior to the Latins.") To the Latin nobles, valor in battle was the prime virtue, a quality toward which the Greeks, as a far less military-minded people, had a different attitude (see MGH, *Scriptores*, 26:66). Petrarch, who prized ancient Greek learning, later even termed the Greeks "worse than the Turks" (*Lettere Senili di F. Petrarca* [Florence, 1869], pp. 422-24).

33. On Humbert of Romans, see his irenic *Opus Tripartitum*, in Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 24, cols. 106-36 (cf. my *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, p. 227). On Barlaam see my two chapters on "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," cited above, and G. Schirò, *Barlaam Calabro: Epistole greche, i primordi episodici e dottrinari delle lotte esicaste* (Palermo, 1954). Also of importance is M. Viller, "La question de l'union des églises entre Grecs et Latins," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 16 (1921): 260-305, 515-32; 18 (1922): 20-60. Further, on Barlaam see my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 68; and below, chap. 4.
34. The term "nativistic reaction" is used in S. Lipset, *Radical Right* (Cambridge, 1969), to refer to the reaction of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants against a new wave of southern Europeans (Catholics and Orthodox) emigrating to America and who might change the sociocultural balance. On "nativistic" movements, cf. also R. Linton, "The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation," in D. Walker, ed., *The Emergent Native American* (Boston, 1972). Other scholars also use the term. On "revitalization movement," see A. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956): esp. 267, 278.
35. On Byzantine use of *Hellene* as "pagan," see chaps. 7 and 9, esp. nn. 9 and 65; and now esp. Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, passim. Also see S. Runciman, "Byzantine and Hellene in the Fourteenth Century," *Tomos Harmenopoulos* (1951), pp. 29-30. A few instances of the term *Hellene* had appeared already in Byzantine Nicaea in the thirteenth century. But the term became much more common in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.
36. See G. von Grönebaum, works cited in n. 1. Also see n. 34 above, the important work of Wallace.
37. On Hesychasm, see chap. 4 and also the authoritative work of J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959), translated as *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, by G. Lawrence (London, 1965); also Meyendorff's, *St. Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe* (Bourges, 1959); V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London, 1957); and for an excellent, convenient summary of Byzantine mysticism, S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 128-58.
38. On the controversial question of the origins of the Palaeologan artistic Renaissance and its relation to the Italian Renaissance, there is a growing literature. See A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (Switzerland: Skira, 1953), pp. 44-45, and his *Byzantine Art in the Middle Ages* (London, 1963). More recent is



- O. Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West* (New York, 1970), esp. pp. 218-40; J. Beckwith, *The Art of Constantinople* (London-New York, 1961); and D. Rice, *Byzantine Painting: The Last Phase* (New York, 1968). See also the old but still useful A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, Wis., 1961) 2: 709 ff. Most persuasive is E. Kitzinger, "The Byzantine Contribution to Western Art of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17 (1963): 25-48. See now also S. Runciman, *Byzantine Style and Civilization* (Harmondsworth, 1975), pp. 165-212, which is remarkably forceful and objective.
39. Cf. the "effusions" of the sociologist D. Darlington, *The Evolution of Man and Society* (New York, 1969), p. 373: "And in the sunset days of the fourteenth century the doctrines or 'hallucinations' (my quotations) of Gregory Palamas, archbishop of Salonika, helped to renew the feeling of ecstasy in the people of the dying empire [!] See on this disputed problem of Byzantine art and Hesychasm, the objective judgment of D. Obolensky, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 358-59, who discusses especially the influence of Hesychastic views on Palaeologan art. He affirms that the arguments for such influence are not yet conclusive for scholarship except in the case of the theme and iconography of the Transfiguration, which figures prominently in Palamas' Hesychastic theology: see below, esp. chaps. 4 and 7. Cf. Rice, *Byzantine Painting*, pp. 178-89, and Haussig, *Byzantine Civilization*, pp. 363-64, both emphasizing Hesychastic influence on art.
  40. On the Palaeologan revival of classical letters, see chap. 13 and Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, passim, with bibliography. Also recently, S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1950), which deals with events from the Byzantine side and not from the Italian; H. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos, 1370-1436/7* (Vienna, 1969); and J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos* (Paris, 1959); see below, n. 42, for Sevčenko's recent article. On the "first" Byzantine "renaissance" (of the ninth and tenth centuries, the age of Photius, Arethas, and Constantine VII), see now P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971).
  41. The Palaeologan classical revival is a complex phenomenon, all the implications of which have not yet been clarified. Of course, to repeat, Byzantium had never lost its interest in the ancient classical Greek works (hence a true "renaissance" was, fundamentally, impossible), but, earlier, hostile or semi-hostile attitudes of the church and other factors had sometimes prevented these classical interests from emerging nearly as forcefully and clearly as in the Palaeologan "renaissance." See below, n. 46, the remark of Beck on the church and ancient learning.
  42. It should be noted that at this time in Byzantium there was also a rather substantial, if less significant, interest in science, as seen in such figures as Theodore Metochites, Chrysokokkes, Planudes, and others: see Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, pp. 52 ff., 63 ff.; I. Sevčenko, "Théodore Metochites, Chora, et courants intellectuels" (Venice, 1971); D. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium* (New York, 1972), pp. 429-30; and his "The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning in the Fourteenth Century," *Studies in Church*



- History* 5 (Leiden, 1969): 23-57. Also R. Browning, "Byzantine Scholarship," in *Past and Present* 28 (1964): 3-20. Cf. below, chap. 4, text and n. 17, for Byzantine interest in mathematics and Arabic numerals.
43. E.g. A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (1953), p. 45. For the remark, see Kitzinger p. 47 (cf. note 38).
44. E.g. see A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 562-63, 709-11.
45. See D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth* (London, 1971), pp. 336-43, and G. Maloney, *Russian Hesychasm. The Spirituality of Nil Sorskij* (The Hague, 1973). On Hesychasm as a conservative force in art, see Runciman, *Byzantine Style and Civilization*, p. 200; cf. Rice, *Byzantine painting*, pp. 178-92 and Haussig, *Byzantine Civilization*, p. 364.
46. See H. G. Beck's fascinating remarks in his chapter "Intellectual Life in the Late Byzantine Church," in *Handbook of Church History*, ed. H. Jedin, vol. 4 (1968), esp. pp. 505 ff.: "For the first time in Byzantine intellectual history even the churchmen no longer regarded the legacy of antiquity as mere decoration and merely to be tolerated for possible use." The new emphasis on Greek learning was more "secular" in the sense that it was usually "outer" (nontheological) learning, not "inner" (theological). And yet these humanists were still guided by Christian categories of thought.
47. See chaps. 9-14.
48. See chap. 9.
49. See below, e.g. chap. 3, n. 27. Also R. Walzer, *Greek into Arabic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 60-113.
- 49a. L. Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis* (Paderborn, 1952), p. 481. Apostolis lived mainly in Venetian Crete.
50. See chap. 9.
51. See chap. 10.
52. See chap. 13, esp. on Chalcondyles' teaching at Padua University and his (Latin) inaugural address, which is here printed in its entirety.
53. See below, esp. chaps. 2 and 9.
54. On this reorientation, esp. in early fifteenth-century Florentine humanism, from the Latin rhetorical emphasis (esp. on Cicero) to the philosophical, with stress on Plato's metaphysical thought, see chap. 13 and esp. G. Holmes, *The Florentine Enlightenment* (New York, 1969), chap. 8, "The Return to Metaphysics," pp. 242-66, which emphasizes the importance of the teaching of Argyropoulos in Florence for the transformation. Cf. also J. Seigel's article, "The Teaching of Argyropoulos and the Rhetoric of the First Humanists," *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton, 1969); and very recently, E. Garin, *Portraits from the Quattrocento* (New York, 1973), esp. pp. 70 ff.; and P. Kristeller, *Renaissance Concepts of Man* (New York, 1972), chaps. 4-5. See now also D. Geanakoplos' article "The Italian Renaissance and Byzantium: The Career of the Greek John Argyropoulos, Humanist Professor in Florence and Rome," in *Conspectus of History*, 1, no. 1 (1974), *Focus on Biography* (Muncie, Ind., 1975), pp. 12-28.

## Notes to Chapter 1

1. On Constantinople's population at its height, most scholars have cited the



- figures given (see A. Andreades, "De la population de Constantinople," *Metron*, 1, no. 2 [1920]: 7, nn. 1, 32): 700,000 to 800,000 in the fourth century, certainly more later. See also T. Chandler, *Cities of the World* (New York, 1940). Cf. P. Charanis, "Byzantine Population," *Proceedings of the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, Oxford, 1966 (London, 1967), pp. 448-49, who fixes on some 500,000 (see his extensive notes with bibliography). See also D. Miller, *Imperial Constantinople* (New York, 1969), p. 6, which cites the various opinions, and T. Rice, *Everyday Life in Byzantium* (London, 1967), p. 144: 1 million.
2. Cf. my study, "Byzantium," in N. Cantor, ed., *Perspectives on the Past* (New York, 1972), p. 139.
  3. In many chapters below, esp. 3.
  4. See W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 11.
  5. On the Greek Fathers see below, chap. 3, beginning section, and chap. 14. Also see: Jaeger, *passim*; R. Payne, *The Holy Fire* (London, 1958)—rather popularized; and J. Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (Chicago, 1971), pp. 211-25, and his *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom* (Chicago, 1974).
  6. See his "Address to Young Men on the Right Use of Greek Literature," trans. F. Padelford (New York, 1902), pp. 97-120. See below, chap. 14.
  7. For a description of "apophatic" theology, see chaps 3, 4, and 6. See also *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (under that entry) and, for the Orthodox view, V. Lossky, *The Vision of God*, trans. A. Moorhouse (Clayton, Wisc., 1963), pp. 122 ff., etc. and (in Greek) *Religious and Ethical Encyclopedia* (Athens), under "apophatic."
  8. For a convenient treatment of the emperor's authority over the church (and esp. his liturgical privileges, frequently misunderstood), see D. Geanakoplos, "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism" (with bibliography, pp. 195-96), in *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 58-84.
  9. On the archons and the Byzantine church, see esp. L. Bréhier, *Les Institutions de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1949), esp. pp. 506 and 495-506 *passim*. On archontes in the post-Byzantine period, see N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance* (Bucharest, 1971, reprint) pp. 117-29. On their role in the fifteenth century, see *Les 'Mémoires' de Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence*, ed. V. Laurent (Paris, 1971), p. 384. Also now cf. J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les Offikia* (Paris, 1970), under archon.
  10. On the Slavic conversion, see esp. Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1970), and D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth* (London, 1972), esp. chaps. 3-4, 10.
  11. On this (occasional) Byzantine objection to the liturgy in the vernacular, see esp. G. Soulis, "The Legacy of Cyril and Methodius to the Southern Slavs," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 19 (1965): 34.
  12. On Byzantine Hesychasm, see esp. chaps. 4 and 11 (citing Meyendorff in particular). On the Russians see Obolensky, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 301-08, 336-43; and Maloney's book *Russian Hesychasm* (The Hague, 1973).
  13. See below, chap. 3. Also on the liturgy, see esp. F. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1896), and W. Lethaby and H. Swainson, *The*



- Church of Sancta Sophia* (London, 1894). See below, sect. 9 of Bibliog.
14. See below chap. 3, citation of E. Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (rev. ed., Oxford, 1961), and esp. his *Eastern Elements in Western Chant* (Oxford, 1947). See also N. Tomadakes, *Introduction to Byzantine Literature* (Athens, 1958), pp. 171 ff. (in Greek).
  15. For English trans. (with Greek text) of the Akathistos, see *The Acathistos Hymn*, ed. G. Meersseman (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1958).
  16. On Byzantine stained glass, see esp. A. Megaw, "Notes on Recent Work of the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963): esp. 364. On Byzantine painting especially, see below, chap. 3 and also Prologue text and 37-43, on the Palaeologan artistic Renaissance. On "Macedonian" and "Cretan," terms invented by G. Millet, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Evangile . . . d'après les monuments de Mistra, Macédoine, et du Mont-Athos* (Paris, 1916), but now discarded as unclear, see T. Rice, *Byzantine Painting: The Last Phase* (London, 1968), pp. 181 f., and the pioneer but now dated work of R. Byron and T. Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting* (London, 1930), passim. See recently O. Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West* (New York, 1970), pp. 70 and 179.
  17. Cf. A. Haussig, *History of Byzantine Civilization* (London, 1971), p. 361.
  18. On these colors, see, for example, A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (Skira ed., 1953), pp. 45-46; and on elongation, S. Cirac, "L'hellénisme de D. Theotokopouli Crétois," *Kretika Chronika* 2 (1961): 213 ff.
  19. On the great Byzantine painter (probably of the fourteenth century), see now A. Xyngopoulos, *Manuel Panselinos* (Athens, 1956), in Greek.
  20. V. Lazarev, *Feofan Grek* (Moscow, 1961), pp. 81-87, 98-100. (in Russian).
  21. Formerly it was believed he went to Venice at the age of eighteen, with great effect, therefore, on his artistic formation. For bibliography on El Greco, see below, chap. 3.
  22. See Paul the Silentiary's poem, in P. Friedlander, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912), pp. 227-65.
  23. See text translation in G. Vernadsky, *Source Book for Russian History*, 1 (New Haven, 1972): 25-26.
  24. *De Cerimoniis, Le Livre de Cérémonies* ed. A. Voigt. (Paris, 1939) and Pseudo-Codinus, *Traité des offices* ed. J. Verpeaux (Paris, 1966).
  25. On Byzantine titles, see esp. L. Bréhier, *Les Institutions de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris, 1949), pp. 138-53 and 495-506 especially.
  26. For the liturgy and "The Emperor as Builder," see G. Downey, *Constantinople* (Norman, Okla., 1960), esp. p. 113. and also cf. my chap. 5.
  27. See S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 182-85 and T. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, vol. 1 (Brussels, 1952).
  28. On these ecclesiastical offices, see esp. Bréhier, *Les Institutions*, section on same, esp. pp. 498-506, and E. Villas, "Titles and Offices of the Patriarchal Order of St. Andrew" (New York: Greek Archdiocese, 1967; brochure).
  29. On the relics seized, see P. Riant, *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1876); also N. Baynes, "The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople," esp. pp. 248-60. For Villehardouin, see M. Shaw, trans., *Chronicles*



- of the *Crusades* (London, 1963), p. 90-91 (for brief mention); but esp. Robert of Clari, *The Conquest of Constantinople*, ed. E. McNeal (New York, 1936), pp. 102 ff.
30. On the relics of the Virgin, esp. her mantle and girdle (the city's palladia), see Baynes, "Supernatural Defenders," pp. 248-60.
  31. Again on these officials, Bréhier, *Les Institutions*, and Villas, "Titles and Offices." See also now Darrouzès, *Recherches Sur les Officia de l'église byzantine*, on these offices.
  32. On the university, see the old work of F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1926); also now esp. P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1972); M. Kyriakes, "The University: Origin and Early Phases in Constantinople," *Byzantion* 41 (1971): 161-182; the old works of L. Bréhier, "Notes sur l'histoire de l'enseignement supérieure à Constantinople," *Byzantion* 4 (1927-28): 14-28, and his "L'enseignement supérieure à Constantinople du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* 38 (1899): 97-112. On the patriarchal school in particular—which involves unsolved questions—see my *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 168; R. Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," *Byzantion* 23 (1962): 84-186; Bréhier, *idem*; and M. Paranikas, *Schediasma . . . peri ton Grammaton* (Constantinople, 1867) pp. 153 ff. (in Greek). On the patriarchal school under the Turks, see Runciman, *Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 208 ff., and bibliography; and on Koracs, see Runciman, *idem*, pp. 392-93. On the patriarchal titles cited, see also Villas, "Titles and Offices."
  33. On this hospital-orphanage (of the Pantocrator), see esp. D. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1968), pp. 171-79, 249-50, with bibliography.
  34. See above, n. 24, citing *De Cerimoniis* and Pseudo-Codinus; cf. Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 498-506; and now Villas, "Titles and Offices."
  35. Cf. Runciman, *Great Church*, p. 39; and Bréhier, esp. pp. 495-506.

## Notes to Chapter 2

1. On Jews in the empire, see J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire* (Athens, 1939), esp. pp. 1-10. Also P. Charanis, "The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Palaeologi," *Speculum* 22 (1947): 75-77; and A. Andreades, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire* (Athens, 1929). Finally, see now A. Sharf, *The Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (London, 1971), whose thesis is that the Jews, within limits, were tolerated though they were in effect second-class citizens. Byzantine Jews usually lived in their own communities.
2. On the Armenians, see P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (Lisbon, 1963).
3. On the Slavs inside and outside the empire, see esp. recently D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth, 500-1453* (New York, 1972), *passim*, and esp. chap. 9.



4. On the emperor and the Monophysites, see G. Ostrogorsky, *The Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1969), esp. pp. 58 ff., 64 ff., 107-09.
5. See Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, esp. p. 60; "Monophysitism was an outlet for political separatist tendencies of Egypt and Syria." Also A. H. M. Jones, *Were Ancient Heresies Disguised Social Movements?* (Philadelphia, 1966).
6. On Eusebian theory, see D. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (Oxford, 1966), chap. 2 on church and state, and bibliography listed.
7. See chap. 5, "Church Construction and Caesaropapism," and Epilogue.
8. P. Charanis, *The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First* (Madison, 1939); also Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 58.
9. Geanakoplos, p. 61.
10. On Bulgars and Russ, see Obolensky, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 83-98 and 274-75, esp. 200-01: "Vladimir and his successors were wholly independent of Byzantium in political matters [but] they all . . . recognized that the Emperor as the head of the Orthodox Christian community, possessed by divine right a metapolitical jurisdiction over Russia"; G. Ostrogorsky, "The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order," in *The Slavonic and East European Review* 35 (1956-57): 1-14.
11. "Commonwealth" is Obolensky's term (*Byzantine Commonwealth*, passim). Also on the Byzantine "Family of Princes," see A. Grabar, "God and the Family of Princes presided over by the Byzantine Emperor," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954): 117-23.
12. Obolensky, pp. 284-85. Cf. the analogy of the West and Byzantine culture in my Epilogue.
13. On Varangians, see below, chap. 7, n. 37, their commander being Michael Palaeologus.
14. On mosques in Constantinople, see *New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 734, 726, and 283, for various periods. On the Amalfi monastery, see A. Pertusi, "Monasteri e monaci italiani all'Athos nell'alto Medioevo," *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos*, 1 (Chevtogne, 1963): 217-53; also P. Lemerle, "Les archives du monastère des Amalfitains au Mont Athos," *Ep. Het. Byz. Spoudon* 23 (1953): 548-66. Cf. also now R. Lopez, on "Foreigners in Byzantium," *Miscellanea C. Verlinden* (1974), pp. 348-49, for Arabs, Armenians, Italians, and others.
15. On the Paulicians, see D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1948), and his *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 119-22, 215-16; and S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge, 1947).
16. P. Alexander, "The Strength of Empire and Capital as seen through Byzantine Eyes," *Speculum* 37 (1962): 341-57.
17. Cf. P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1972).
18. "On Iconoclasm there is a large literature. I cite only the recent M. Anastos, "Iconoclasm and Imperial Rule," in *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 61-103; and pp. 66-67 on the Arab ruler. The latest article is P. Brown, "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *English Historical Review* 346 (1973): 1 ff.
19. On "icon of Christ," see Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, esp. p. 59. On Moses and Aaron, see G. Ostrogorsky, "Relations between Church



- and State," *Sem. Kond.* 4 (1933): 121 ff. (in Russian); and Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East*, p. 63.
20. On exceptions to this policy of tolerance, see below, chap. 1, n. 11.
  21. J. Erickson, "Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 14 (1970): 3-23. While the West used "azymes," it sometimes grudgingly tolerated the Greek "enzymes." But the Greeks always condemned the Latin "azymes."
  22. On Charles, see D. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959; rpt. Hamden, Conn., 1972), pp. 189 ff.
  23. *Ibid.*, p. 271; esp. M. Laurent, *Le bienheureux Innocent V* (Vatican, 1947), p. 424, n. 23. On Latinization, see Prologue and Epilogue, nn. 20 ff.
  24. On Michael, see esp. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, pp. 269-71; on 1453, see below, chap. 11, n. 20.
  25. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, p. 270.
  26. Quoted in Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East*, pp. 3-4, and cf. p. 104, n. 77.
  27. *Ibid.*, p. 2 and n. 3.
  28. N. Kalogeras, *Mark Eugenikos and Cardinal Bessarion* (Athens, 1893), p. 70.
  29. Cited in Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 106 and n. 84.
  30. On this, see chap. 9 below, *passim*.
  31. On Cydones, see below, chap. 4; also Prologue and Epilogue.
  32. A. Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, vol. 1 (New Brunswick, N.J., 1970), esp. pp. 126-35 and 172-78.
  33. Cf. Obolensky, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 257 ff.
  34. *Ibid.*, p. 363, on Russ view that Greek sins brought on the catastrophe of 1453. S. Runciman, *Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 159-61.
  35. *Passim*, esp. nn. 15 ff.
  36. See D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, 1962), p. 81 (rpt. as *Byzantium and the Renaissance* [Hamden, Conn., 1971]); cf. chap. 9, n. 1, below.
  37. On Nicousios, see Bibliog. in Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East*, esp. p. 179 and n. 28.
  38. On Maxim the Greek, see esp. V. Ikonnikov, *Maksim Grek i ego vremia*, 2 vols. (Kiev, 1915); and also my forthcoming monograph on him. Cf. R. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe* (New York, 1970), pp. 87-95.
  39. Cf. recently, G. Arnakis, *The Ottoman Empire and the Balkan States to 1900* (Austin-New York, 1969), chaps. 5-6. On education, cf. chap. 9, below.
  40. On this term, see my Prologue, n. 2, and Epilogue, nn. 21 ff.
  41. On nationalism, see below, chap. 9. Also on "Hellene," Vakalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, *passim*. On Pletho's paganism, see F. Masai, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, *passim*. On Pletho's paganism, see F. Masai, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, *passim*. An early reference to "Hellenes" is in A. Lepathenos' letter to Gregoras, ca. 1355: S. Runciman, "Byzantine and Hellene in the Fourteenth Century," *Tomos Harmenopoulos* (1952), pp. 27-33; and his *Last Byzantine Renaissance*, pp. 18-23. Also C. Patrinelis, "An Unknown Letter of D. Cydones," *Greek Roman Byzantine Studies* (1973).
  42. On Latinization, see this book, Prologue and Epilogue; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, *passim*; my *Byzantine East*, p. 104, n. 79, p. 106, n. 84; T. Congar, *After Five Hundred Years* (New York, 1959), pp. 29-48.
  43. See quotation in Obolensky, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, p. 264.



## Notes to Chapter 3

1. E.g. N. Baynes, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), pp. 71-73.
2. MSS survive, for example, of a bilingual grammar of Dositheos Magister (probably third to fourth-century), used by Greeks to learn Latin (one is at St. Gall).
3. The sense of community is a main theme of this book (see esp. Prologue); also, P. Lemerle, "L'Orthodoxie byzantine et l'oecumenisme médiéval: les origines du "schisme" des églises," *Bulletin Association G. Budé* (1954), pp. 228-46; also, I. Sevčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* (1955), p. 295. Now Southern, cited in next note.
4. On the differing theological approaches of East and West in the fourth and fifth centuries, see J. Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom* (Chicago, 1974), chap. 4. and the chapter of R. Southern, "The Divisions of Christendom," esp. pp. 53-67, in *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Middlesex. Eng., 1970).
5. The Latin aristocracy and middle class of the early empire were generally bilingual. In the East the lingua franca was *koiné* Greek.
6. See *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (entry "Jerome") on Jerome's visit to Constantinople in A.D. 330. Also the biography of P. Gallay, *La vie de St. Grégoire de Nazianze* (Lyons, 1943), and the seventh-century biography by a priest, Gregorius (*MPG*, 35, cols. 243-304).
7. See below, this chapter.
8. On Gregory's rhetorical skill, see P. Gallay, *Langue et style de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (Paris, 1933). Also R. Payne, *The Holy Fire* (London, 1958), pp. 196-222 (a rather popular treatment). On ancient rhetoric in general, see H. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1948).
9. Especially by W. Jaeger and his students. See Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), and his *De instituto Christiano, Greg. Nyss. Opera* (Leiden, 1952). Also Gregory of Nyssa's *Contra Eunomium* (*Opera*, ed. W. Jaeger), vol. 2 (Leiden, 1950), etc. Cf. J. Danielou, "Platonisme et théologie mystique, essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de Grégoire de Nyssa. . .," *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* (1953), pp. 338, etc., and cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology* 3 (Utrecht, 1966), bibliography on pp. 291-92. Also see H. Musurillo, ed., *From Glory to Glory* (London, 1962).
10. On Dionysius there is a large literature. For a brief account (in English), see Payne, *Holy Fire*, pp. 263-80. For a more scholarly account, see H. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), pp. 348 f., 366 f., etc.
11. See his *Mystical Theology* (English ed., Surrey, 1949), p. 14. On Eastern apophatic theology and mysticism, see, e.g., V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Cambridge-London, 1957), esp. chap. 2.
12. On the flight of Greek monks to the West in these periods (as many as 50,000 came in the eighth and ninth centuries, according to L. White, *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* [Cambridge, Mass., 1938], pp. 15-17); cf. J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantine* (Paris, 1904), Also K. Setton, "The



- Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 100 (1956): 7.
13. On John's influence on the West, see esp. M. Anastos, "Some Aspects of Byzantine Influence on Latin Thought," *Twelfth-century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society* (Madison, 1961), pp. 149-63, with bibliography. Also E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 91-92.
  14. On such monasteries, see J. McNulty and B. Hamilton, "'Orientale Lumen' et 'Magistra Latinitas,' Greek Influences on Latin Monasticism," *Le Milieu du Mont Athos* (Chevtogne, 1963), p. 131. Also B. Hamilton, "The City of Rome and the Eastern Churches," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 27 (1961): 2-26.
  15. Even had the Greeks and Latins been able to comprehend one another's languages, it still would have been hard successfully to communicate theologically because of the growing mutual hostility. On the difficulties in translating each other's theological terms—especially *prosopon*, *hypostasis*, *substantia*, *vicarius*, *aitia*, and *metanoia*—see Y. Congar, *After 900 Years* (New York, 1959), p. 31.
  16. On the common view, see esp. E. Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins," *Sacris Erudiri* 5 (1953): 214 ff. Now cf. J. Ryan, ed., *Augustine's Confessions* (Garden City, N.Y., 1960), pp. 214 ff., introduction, which affirms that Augustine, while not acquiring a thorough mastery of Greek as a young man, later went on to much improve his knowledge, and thus in later life, when he did most of his theological writing, knew a considerable amount of Greek. Ryan also believes that Augustine might have read Plato in the original.
  17. J. Hussey, *Church and learning in the Byzantine Empire* (New York, 1937), p. 203.
  18. See below, chap. 4.
  19. See under "Gregory the Great," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Gregory seems to have disliked the Byzantine court as hypocritical. See esp. below, chap. 4.
  20. See below chap. 14.
  21. On the Lyons and Florence councils, see chapters 8 and 11.
  22. See esp. my chaps. 4 and 14.
  23. On Traversari, see esp. L. Mehus, *Ambrosii Traversarii . . . latinae epistolae* (Florence, 1959). Also D. Traversari, *Ambrogio Traversari e i suoi tempi* (Florence, 1912), and this book, chap. 14. On Manuel Calecas, see chap. 4 below and esp. summary biography in R. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas* (Vatican City, 1950).
  24. On Valla, see esp. the new work of S. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla. Umanesimo e Teologia* (Florence, 1972); and also cf. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, pp. 238-46, on Ducas' (usually overlooked) application of philology to the *New Testament* (see chap. 10). Also see A. Perosa, *Collatio Novi Testamenti* (Florence, 1970) on Valla's use of Greek knowledge for his edition of the *New Testament*; and on philology and humanism in general, see below, chaps. 13-14. (esp. on Traversari and Valla's dislike for scholasticism).



25. See an even stronger statement by E. Gilson, in *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), p. 541: "Practically every notable event in the history of Western thought in the Middle Ages is tied up with the presence of a man who had studied in Greece, or who knew Greek and had translated some Greek philosophic writings or had access to such translations."
26. On Muslim interpretation and the admixture of Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thought, see T. Arnold and A. Guillaume, *The Legacy of Islam* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 240-41; and P. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, p. 307. See now R. Walzer, *Greek into Arabic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 60-113.
27. C. Haskins, *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (New York, 1968), p. 292.
28. John died ca. A.D. 750. He was in the employ of the Arab caliph.
29. On Cerbanus, A. Urbansky, *Byzantium and the Danube Frontier* (New York, 1968); A. Bryer, "Cultural Relations . . . in the Twelfth Century," in *Relations between East and West* (Edinburgh, 1973), p. 81.
30. On Moerbeke's translation of the *Politics*, see E. Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford, 1957), p. 136. From the end of the twelfth to the end of the thirteenth century, the proportion of translations made from Greek to those made from the Arab, at second hand, gradually increased. It is not usually known that Moerbeke also translated the *Poetics* of Aristotle (P. Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters* [Rome, 1956], pp. 340-41 and 23.) The *Poetics* was thus known to the thirteenth-century Western world. On Aquinas and John of Damascus, see Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy*, p. 92. Thomas himself cites John (see *Summa Theologica*, pt. 1, quaestio 36, art. 2 ad tertium). The degree of Thomas's knowledge of John of Damascus' work has not been established.
31. Yet, see previous note on the *Poetics* of Aristotle.
32. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, passim, esp. pp. 284-86.
33. On Erigena, see M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1933).
34. Dionysius had first been brought to the West in the ninth century through Abbot Hilduin of St. Denis. See M. Viller and K. Rahner, *Askese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* (1939).
35. F. Masai, *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris, 1956).
36. On Valla see n. 24, above.
37. See below, chap. 13. Also A. della Torre, *Storia dell'Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (Florence, 1902).
38. Apparently Ficino did not use the works of Pletho.
39. On this important conflict, see esp. E. Burt, *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science* (London, 1925), pp. 40 ff., who emphasizes the importance of the mathematical type of thinking in Plato (via Pythagoras) to be found in Neoplatonic thought. This, he says, led to the Copernican theory. Burt is opposed by E. W. Strong, *Procedures and Metaphysics* (Berkeley, 1936) and J. Randall, "Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua," *Journal of History of Ideas* (1940), pp. 176-206, who emphasizes, rather, the method (Aristotelianism) of Padua University for the rise of modern science. See also J. Randall, *The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science*



- (Padua, 1961); P. Duhem, *La système du monde* (Paris, 1954), vols. 7-8.
40. See below chap. 9, n. 18.
  41. See A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, Wis., 1952), p. 491. The Latin version had been translated from the Greek in 1160 in Sicily. In 1175, Gerard of Cremona translated the work from the Arabic at Toledo. See now, A. Bryer, "Cultural Relations between East and West . . ." in *Relations between East and West*, ed. Baker (Edinburgh, 1973), p. 80.
  42. P. Rose, "The *Mechanica* in the Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance* 18 (1971): 76-77.
  43. See, in N. Baynes and H. Moss, *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization* (Oxford, 1961), the essay by F. Marshall and J. Mavrogordato, "Byzantine Literature," pp. 221 ff. Also cf. R. Jenkins, "The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963): esp. 39 and 52; and N. B. Tomadakes, *Introduction to Byzantine Literature*, 1 (Athens, 1958): esp. 16 ff. (in Greek).
  44. A. Pertusi, *Leonzio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio* (Venice, 1964). See G. Cammelli, *Manuele Crisolora* (Florence, 1941), pp. 8, 44, etc.
  45. Cammelli, and Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, p. 24.
  46. On the problem of origins and the romance, see bibliography in K. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," pp. 38-39. Also see the *Basic Library* (Athens, 1955) analysis of E. Kriaras (in Greek). Cf. U. Holmes, *A History of Old French Literature to 1300* (New York, 1937), pp. 146-49.
  47. On Salerno's origins, see *History of Science Ancient and Medieval*, ed. R. Taton, English trans. (New York, 1963), article by G. Beaujouan, p. 476. On Roger see A. Crombie, *Medieval and Early Modern Science* (New York, 1959), 1: 232-36. Also see P. Kristeller, "Ancient Philosophy at Salerno in the Twelfth Century" (unpublished paper), where it is shown that in the eleventh century a certain Bartholomaeus knew Greek there. On early Western medicine, see L. MacKinney, "Tenth-Century Medicine," in "Symposium in the 10th century," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 9 (1955): 10-13.
  48. Ch. Diehl, *La société byzantine à l'époque des Comnènes* (Paris, 1929), pp. 51-56, and G. Schreiber, "Byzantinisches und abendländisches Hospital," *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* 1 (1948): esp. 42 ff.
  49. Crombie, *Medieval and Early Modern Science*, 1: 234.
  50. See J. Theodorides, "Byzantine Science," *History of Science Ancient and Medieval*, ed. R. Taton, trans. A. Pomerans (New York, 1957), pp. 440 ff. Ibid., 1: 220. MacKinney, "Tenth-Century Medicine," p. 12. E. Nordensköld, *History of Biology* (New York, 1942). On Musurus, see D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, p. 162.
  51. G. Sarton, *An Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore, 1931), p. 171. F. Chalandon, *Les Comnènes* (Paris, 1912) 2: 317 ff. On the Byzantine silk industry, see esp. R. Lopez, "Silk Manufacture in the Byzantine Empire," *Speculum* 29: 1 ff.
  52. H. Bloch, "Monte Cassino, Byzantium, and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 3 (1946): 163-224. In the tenth century,



- bronze doors were cast at Hildesheim for Bishop Bernard, who had them copied from the Byzantine-inspired doors made at Aachen for Charlemagne. See F. Tschan, *St. Bernard of Hildesheim*, 2 (Notes Dame, 1942): 142, 168-69, and 200, n. 6.
53. See Theophilus Presbyter, *Schedula Diversarum Artium*, ed. H. Hagen (Vienna, 1874), esp. pp. 114-17. Also, A. Megaw's report in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963): 362.
  54. See esp. E. Kitzinger, "On the Portrait of Roger II in the Martorana in Palermo," *Proportioni* (1950), 3, pp. 30-34, who emphasizes the fact that Roger wore the costume of a Byzantine emperor (as he does on several coins and seals) and was addressed as Basileus, but also that the German imperial imagery of the Ottonians provides a precedent for Roger's face done in imitation of Christ. On the Norman rulers and Byzantine theocracy, see also A. Marongiu, "Lo spirito della monarchia Normanna della Sicilia," *Arch. stor. sic.*, ser. 3, vols. 50-51, pp. 115 ff.; and L. R. Ménager, "L'institution monarchique dans les états normandes d'Italie," *Cahiers des civilisations médiévales* (1959): 2 303 ff., who opposes such theories.
  55. On Nilus Doxopates, see the article of V. Laurent in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géog. eccl.*, 14, cols. 769-71. Also Ch. Diehl, *Byzantium, Greatness and Decline*, pp. 285-87.
  56. See G. Ferrari dalle Spade, "La legislazione dell'impero d'Oriente in Italia," *Italia e Grecia* (Florence, 1939), pp. 225-53. Cf. Dölger, "Byzanz und das Abendland vor den Kreuzzügen," p. 109.
  57. G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1957), pp. 216 ff. Also R. Lopez, "Byzantine Law in the Seventh Century and its Reception by the Germans and Arabs," *Byzantion* 16 (1942-3): 445 ff. Byzantine law was in force in Byzantine Sicily and southern Italy but evidently had no lasting influence there; yet it was known to, and did, affect the Franks (Latins) living in the East. The influence of Germanic law was probably responsible for the curious appearance of the ordeal by fire in 1253 at the trial of Michael Palaeologus: see below, chap. 7.
  58. H. Scheltema, *New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4. no. 2, pp. 71-73.
  59. On Rhodian sea law, see W. Ashburner, *Rhodian Sea Law* (Oxford, 1909). Also W. P. Gormley, "The Development of the Rhodian-Roman Sea Law to 1861," *Inter-American Law Review* 3 (1961): 319 ff. On Byzantine navigational terms and the West, see H. and R. Kahane and A. Tietze, *The Lingua Franca in the Levant* (Urbana, Ill., 1958). esp. pp. 571, 503, 552, etc. For *dreki*, see S. A. Anderson, *Viking Enterprise* (New York, 1936). p. 62, and W. Vogel, "Nordische Seefahrten im früheren Mittelalter," *Meereskunde*, vol. 1, pt. 7, p. 25. Cf. J. De Vries, *Altnordisches Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, who says the German *Drache* (dragon) comes from Latin *draco*, itself from ancient Greek. Now see R. Lopez "Foreigners in Byzantium," p. 350, on the increasing Byzantine disinclination to engage in trade, which was left to the Italian cities.
  60. F. Lane, *Venetian Ships and Shipbuilders of the Renaissance* (1934). p. 56.
  61. There has been little done on Byzantine diplomacy. F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatik* (Ettal, 1956) contains documents and analysis; also see D. Obolensky, "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès*



- International des études byzantines* (Ochrida, 1961). A growing number of monographs exist, of course, on the diplomacy of individual emperors.
62. E. Freshfield, ed., *Roman Law in the Later Roman Empire: Book of the Eparch* (Cambridge, 1938). A recent article on the guilds is S. Vryonis, "Byzantine 'Demokratia' and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (Washington, 1963); 289-314; see esp. pp. 289-93 and bibliography in nn. 5 and 13. Also Lopez, "Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire," *Speculum*, 20 (1945): 184 ff.
63. On the round towers, see S. Toy, *A History of Fortification* (London, 1955), pp. 86 ff. On the Normans, see H. Brown, *The English Castle* (London, 1936), p. 23. The Arabs learned fortification from the Greeks, and the West also learned from Byzantium via the Arabs. A. Choisi, *L'art de bâtir chez les byzantins* (Paris, 1883), is not helpful here.
64. A. Kelly, *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).
65. L. Bréhier, *Civilization Byzantine*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1970), pp. 51-52; also Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization*, p. 237; and on Damiani, see A. Capecelatro *Storia di San Pier Damiano* (Florence, 1862). L. Salzman, *English Industries of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1923), p. 171, says that as late as the thirteenth century forks, though known in the West, were seldom provided; the diner used his own knife, and spoons were commonly used.
66. For these terms I am grateful to my friends Henry and René Kahane of the University of Illinois. On the Spanish *quemar* specifically, see J. Corominas, *Breve Diccionario Etimológico de la lengua castellana* (Madrid, 1961). For musical instruments, see K. Sachs, *History of Musical Instruments*.
67. On these terms, also H. and R. Kahane, "Cultural Criteria for Western Borrowing from Byzantine Greek," *Homage to A. Tovar* (Madrid, 1972), pp. 205-29.
68. On the hymns, see esp. E. Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1961); G. Reese, *Music in the Middle Ages*, pp. 157 ff., 79; and N. Tomadakes, *Introduction to Byzantine Literature* (Athens, 1958) pp. 171 ff., 187 ff. (in Greek). On the Akathistos, see next note.
69. On the trisagion, see K. Levy, "The Byzantine Sanctus and its Modal Tradition in East and West," *Annales Musicologiques* 6 (1958-63); 7-67; E. Wellesz, *Eastern Elements in Western Chant* (Oxford, 1947), p. 13. On authorship of the Akathistos, see bibliography in C. del Grande's edition of *L'Inno Acatisto* (Florence, 1948), pp. 30-31. Now E. Wellesz, "On Authorship of the Akathistos," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, no. 18 (1967), pp. 51-52. On the Grottaferrata hymn-writing, see Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music*, p. 130, and L. Tardo, *L'antica melurgia bizantina* (Grottaferrata, 1938).
- 69a. See text in *Liber officialis*, 2. 1, in *Amalarii Episcopi Opera liturgica omnia*, 2, J. Hanssen, ed. (Vatican, 1948), p. 197. Also see Remegius, *De celebratione missae*, MPG v. 101, col. 1248, esp. "ut unum ejus populum nos esse ostendamus, unumque Deus utrumque populum credere, Kyrie Domine, eleeson miserere." See Yale Ph. D. dissertation of my student, B. Kaczynski, "Greek Learning in the Medieval West: A Study of St. Gall, 816-1022" (1975), p. 254.
70. On all this, see esp. Wellesz, *Eastern Elements in Western Chant*, p. 201.



71. On Notker, see *Einhard and Notker the Stammerer*, trans. L. Thorpe (Harmondsworth, 1969), pp. 142-43. Cf. Wellesz, *ibid.*, pp. 168, 201. Also see G. Gray, *The History of Music* (London, 1928), p. 17. On the Arab influence on Charlemagne's court, see H. G. Farmer, *Historical Facts for the Arabian Musical Influence* (London, 1929).
72. See Aurelian, *The Discipline of Music*, trans. J. Ponte (Colorado Springs, 1968) pp. 24-25.
73. On the *echoi*, see Reese, *Music in the Middle Ages*, p. 90. Also on Gregory, see *ibid.*, pp. 73, 90 and, Wellesz, *Eastern Elements*.
74. Reese, p. 120. G. Frotscher, *Geschichte des Orgelspiels*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1935). The gift was evidently that of a hydraulic organ. See Notker, *Einhard and Notker*, p. 143. affirming that Byzantine envoys presented Charlemagne with several kinds of organs and other instruments. William of Malmesbury describes a hydraulic organ made by Gerbert (d. 1003), implying that this was still unique in the West as late as the eleventh century (see *Chronicle of the Kings of England*, trans. J. Giles [London, 1847], p. 175).
75. I. Young, "Franchinus Gaforius, Renaissance Theorist and Composer" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1954).
76. S. Runciman, *Eastern Schism* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 159 ff. Y. Congar, *After Nine Hundred Years* (New York, 1959).
77. See discussion and bibliography in D. Geanakoplos, "On the Schism of the Greek and Roman Churches: A Confidential Papal Directive for the Implementation of Union," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 1 (1954): 16 ff. Also L. Bréhier, "Normal Relations between Rome and the Churches of the East before the Schism of the 11th century," *Constructive Quarterly* 4 (1916): 669 ff. D. Nicol, in his introduction to *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1973), says, "after 975 and 1018 a flood of Westerners, mainly pilgrims, passed through Byzantium."
78. See, for background of possible Byzantine influences on the Cluniac Reform Movement, R. Weiss, "The Greek Culture of South Italy in the Middle Ages," in *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1951), pp. 23-50, and esp. McNulty and Hamilton, "'Orientale Lumen' et 'Magistra Latinitas,'" pp. 181-216.
79. See esp. R. Southern, *Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, 1953), pp. 246-56. Recent works helpful here are, for the Greek viewpoint, J. Kalogerou *Mary, the Perpetual Virgin Theotokos according to the Orthodox Faith* (in Greek; Salonika, 1957) and J. Anastasiou, *The Presentation of the Theotokos: History, Iconography and Hymnography* (in Greek; Salonika, 1959). For the Catholic view M. Gordillo, "Mariologia Orientalis," in *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, p. 141 (Rome, 1954) and M. Jugie, *L'Immaculée Conception dans l'Écriture Sainte et dans la Tradition orientale* (Rome, 1952), pp. 225-40. Also see articles of G. Florovsky and V. Lossky, in E. Mascal, ed., *The Mother of God. A Symposium* (London, 1949); p. Sherwood, "Byzantine Mariology," *Cath. Theol. Society* 15 (1960): 107-34.
80. Ch. Diehl, *Une République patricienne: Venise* (Paris, 1928). Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, p. 35. Especially, see chap. 9. below.



81. The Byzantine monuments of Torcello, Venice's original settlement, date back to the seventh century, and especially the twelfth. Also see Tschann, *St. Bernard of Hildesheim*, 2: 142, 168-69, and 200, n. 6.
82. T. Rice, *Byzantine Art*, pp. 229-32; Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization*, p. 238. Cf. O. Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West*, pp. 154 ff., on England.
83. Bloch, "Montecassino, Byzantium and the West," p. 194. It is believed that the mosaics in the Baptistery of Florence were decorated by Byzantine or Byzantine-trained craftsmen in the thirteenth century. Cf. J. Beckwith's *The Art of Constantinople* (London, 1961), p. 137. Also Kitzinger, "Byzantine Contribution to Western Art of 12th and 13th Centuries," p. 35-44.
84. The church of Cluny was begun in 1089 and dedicated in 1131. See J. Gay, "L'abbaye de Cluny et Byzance au début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Echos d'Orient*, 30 (1931): 84-90. On twelfth-century Byzantine-Western artistic relations, see E. Kitzinger, article in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17 (1963): 47: "a vast field of further inquiry."
85. On stained glass, see above, chap. 1, n. 16, Megaw's article.
86. See P. Schweinfurth, "Die Bedeutung der byzantinischen Kunst für die Stilbildung der Renaissance," *Die Antike* 9 (1933): 2. Also cf. the old work of R. Byron and T. Rice, *The Birth of Western Painting* (London, 1930), and C. Diehl, *Manuel de l'art byzantin*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1925-26), pp. 743-44. Also see next note, and esp. cf. my Prologue. Most important, see now Kitzinger, "Byzantine Contribution," pp. 25-48.
87. Cf. A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (Geneva, 1953), pp. 45-46. Diehl, *Manuel*, pp. 743-44; and V. Lazarev, "Duccio and 13th-Century Greek Icons," *Burlington Magazine* 59 (1931): 159. Cf. now O. Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West*, pp. 238-239, who shows Byzantine ("Hellenistic") influences on El Greco, esp his later painting. Until recently art historians distinguished, in the Palaeologan artistic Renaissance, between the so-called Macedonian and Cretan schools of painting. "Macedonian" was taken to refer in general to the shorter-lived, more realistic art of the fourteenth century, radiating primarily from Thessalonika. And "Cretan" referred to the reversion to (or in some cases continuation of) the more traditional Byzantine modes of painting, found especially at Mt. Athos or on Crete, and extending through the sixteenth century and later. But recently scholars have become more aware of the complexity of Byzantine painting in this period (see e.g., the Prologue to this work, referring to "realism" in fourteenth-century Byzantine art, to the Hesychast influence, and other factors), and have therefore dropped the use of the two terms, at least as opposed to each other. The two terms, Macedonian and Cretan, were originally coined by G. Millet, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Evangile . . . d'après les monuments de Mistra, Macédoine, et du Mont-Athos* (Paris, 1916). Cf. T. Rice, *Byzantine Painting: The Last Phase* (New York, 1968), pp. 103, 109 ff., and O. Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West* (New York, 1967) on these terms. Also now S. Runciman, *Byzantine Style and Civilization* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1975).
88. T. Rice, *Byzantine Art*, p. 256, and his *Art of the Byzantine Era* (New York, 1962), p. 232; R. Byron, *The Byzantine Achievement* (London, 1929), pp. 38,



- 218; F. Rutter, review in *Burlington Magazine* 9 (1932): 274; J. Willumsen, *La Jeunesse du Peintre El Greco* (Paris, 1927), pp. 161 ff., etc. For more on El Greco, see chap. 1 above and chap. 10 below, with bibliography.
89. See C. Mertzios, "Gleanings from the records of the Notary Michael Mara," *Kretika Chronika* 1 (1961-62): 302 ff. (in Greek).
90. On El Greco's similarities to Palaeologan painting, see esp. Rice *Byzantine Painting*, pp. 191-92. Also see W. Wofflin, *Principles of Art History* (New York, 1929), pp. 14-15 on depreciation of line in art. Cf. chap. 1, text and nn. 17-21.
91. U. von Wilamovitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides-Herakles* (Berlin, 1889) 1: 194, and Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*. pp. 288, 290.

## Notes to Chapter 4

1. I hope soon to publish a separate monograph dealing with Western influences on Byzantium. See now D. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (New York, 1966), p. 5. Also below, chap. 7, on German law and Byzantium.
2. E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. Bury (New York, 1914) 6:366-67 (chap. 60). Cf. my article, "Edward Gibbon and Byzantine Ecclesiastical History," *Church History* 35 (1966): 1-16.
3. See esp. W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim, 1947).
4. E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), p. 540 and cf. p. 542. On Byzantine attitudes to the West in the fifth century (esp. A.D. 410 and 476), see W. Kaegi, *Byzantium and the Decline of Rome* (Princeton, N. J., 1968).
5. J. Hussey, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire* (New York, 1937), p. 203. See Kaegi, esp. pp. 240-41, for the little Byzantine knowledge of Augustine.
6. See Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der class. Altert.*, Vol 6 (1909), cols. 2508 ff. on Virius Nicomachus Flavianus's *Annales*, reaching to ca. A.D. 366; also vol. 10, col. 1314-29; F. Dölger, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt den Byzantiner," *Byzanz und die Europäische Staatenwelt* (Etal, 1953). pp. 70-115.
7. See E. Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins," *Sacris Erudiri*, 5 (1953): 214-15. A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the 13-14th Centuries*, 1 (Urbana, 1972): 117.
8. On Leo of Naples's translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes' Alexander story, see W. Buchwald, A. Hohlweg. O. Prinz, *Tusculum Lexicon* (Munich, 1963), p. 297.
9. Check esp. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches*, 5 vols. (Munich-Berlin, 1924-65) for references to such Latins. On the Spaniard mentioned, see C. Will, *Acta et Scripta* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1861), p. 161. On reciprocal ignorance of Latin and Greek, see M. Jugie, *Le Schisme byzantin* (Paris, 1941), pp. 39-42; and S. Runciman, "Byzantine Linguists," *Prosfora to S. Kyriakides* (1953), p. 577 (in Greek).
10. See F. Füchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel* (Amsterdam, 1964), p. 26.
11. On the two brothers, see esp. M. Anastos, "Some Aspects of Byzantine In-



- fluence on Western Thought," *Twelfth-Century Foundations of Modern Europe* (Madison, 1961), pp. 138, 140-49, and bibliography cited.
12. On Byzantine libraries, see recently N. Wilson, in *Greek Roman Byzantine Studies*, 8 (1967):53-80; and L. Reynolds and N. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 50-53, 60-63. On Western knowledge of Greek patristic literature to 1200, see A. Siegmund, *Die Ueberlieferung der griechischen Literatur in der lateinische Kirche* (Munich-Pasing, 1949).
  13. On Anselm of Havelberg, see Migne PL, vol. 188, cols. 1119-1248. On John, see above, chap. 3, n. 30; see also M. Anastos, in *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, ed. M. Clagett, G. Post, R. Reynolds (Madison, 1961), pp. 149-63.
  - 13a. On Greek translations of the Roman mass, see Lumpe, "Abendländisches im Byzanz," col. 322 (in W. Berschin, "Griechisches im lateinisches Mittelalter," *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik*, A. 1. 3-4 [Amsterdam, 1970] pp. 227-304); and A. Strittmater, "Liturgical Latinisms in a Twelfth Century Greek Euchology," *Miscellanea G. Mercati* 3 (Vatican, 1946), pp. 41-64. Cf. this book, Epigraph quoting Anonymous of Tours.
  14. See on Lyons: D. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Hamden, Conn., 1972, new ed.), pp. 258-76, esp. p. 260, n. 8a, on Bonaventura and Aquinas; also M. Roncaglia, *Les frères mineurs et l'église grecque orthodoxe au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Cairo, 1954); B. Roberg, *Die Union . . . auf den Konzil von Lyon* (Bonn, 1964); and P. Franchi, *Il Concilio II di Lione* (Rome, 1965); finally, see below, chap. 11, on Bernardino, discussing Lyons, esp. n. 1, citing my new article.
  15. See esp. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, esp. chaps. 9-11.
  16. G. Hofmann, "Patriarch Johann Bekkos and die lateinische Kultur," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 11 (1945):141-64.
  17. On Planudes there is a growing literature: see esp. M. Treu, *Maximi monachi Planudis, Epistulae* (Breslau, 1890); C. Wendel, "Planudes," in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 20 (1950), cols. 2202-53; and S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 59-60. Planudes used the Arab-Hindi zero and the decimal system (which had been brought to the West by Fibonacci [Leonard of Pisa]). In Byzantium Arabic numerals were almost never used for dates. Cydones probably learned Arabic numerals in Italy. On Planudes and mathematics, esp. at the Chora monastery, see I. Sevcenko, "Théodore Metochites, Chora, et les courants intellectuels de l'époque," *Arte et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues* (1971), pp. 29 f. Cf. below, n. 56.
  18. On Ovid and the Greeks, see W. Schmitt, "Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, 17 (1968): 127-47, esp. 129 and 139. On Augustine's *De Trinitate*, see below n. 27; also C. Wendel, "Planudes," *Byz. Zeitschrift*, 40 (1940): 406-45.
  19. On the Pera monastery, see R. Loenertz, *Les établissements dominicains de Péra-Constantinople*, *Echos d'Orient* 34 (1935):332-49. Also R. Loenertz, "Les dominicains byzantins Theodore et André Chrysoberges. . .," *Arch. Frat. Praed.*, 9 (1939):5-61 and 338; and A. Altaner, "Die Kenntnis des Griechische in den Missionsorden während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 53 (1934): 436 ff. Manuel Calecas learned Latin at the Pera convent under the Italian, Angelo de Scarperia.



20. On the Cydones brothers, see G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cydone, Manuele Caleca, e Teodoro Meleteniota, Studi e Testi*, vol. 56 (Vatican City, 1931). On Cyparissiotis, see this book chap. 6. On Manuel Calecas, see R. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas* (Vatican City, 1950). On Mammas, see my two articles, "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," esp. chap. 3, text and n. 113, in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 3 (Madison, Wis., 1975) and Runciman, *Great Church in Captivity*, p. 168.
21. See A. Dondaine, "Contra Graecos. Premiers écrits polémiques des dominicains d'Orient," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum*, 21 (1951; new ed., Leonine Commission, Vatican, 1967): 387 ff. See also Migne, PG, vol. 140, cols. 487-574.
22. For Cantacuzene's view of Barlaam, see Migne PG, vol. 160, cols. 1083-1301. On Barlaam, see esp. G. Schirò, *Barlaam Calabro, Epistole Greche* (Palermo, 1954) and his *Barlaam and Philosophy in Thessalonika in the 14th Century* (Thessalonika, 1959) (in Greek). On Palamas, see J. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas* (London, 1964) and esp. his *Grégoire Palamas. Les Triades pour la défense de Saintes-hésychastes* (Louvain, 1959). Also see B. Laourdas, "Classical Philology in Thessalonike," *Hellenika* (in Greek).
23. My view. Besides those modern Western scholars who insist that Barlaam was a Nominalist of the Occamite school, others (Schirò, for example) tell me he was, rather, a Scotist. Palamas' views were approved as being in the tradition of the Greek fathers by the Byzantine Hesychast Council of 1361. See A. Papadakes, "Gregory Palamas at the Council of Blachernae, 1351," *Greek Roman Byzantine Studies* 10 (1969): 337-42. M. Jugie, under "Palamas," *Dict. Theol. Cathol.*, affirms the essentially standard Western position that Palamas' theological opinions (on the divine light and the energies of God, etc.) were unknown in Patristic times, and were therefore innovations. This also accords with the view of some of Palamas' Greek opponents. On Palamism at the Council of Florence, see below, chap. 11, nn. 29-33.
24. On the theology involved, see esp. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, pp. 116-242; also B. Krivocheine, "Ascetic and Mystical Teaching of St. Gregory Palamas," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* (1938), no. 4.
25. Printed in Migne PG, vol. 152, cols. 737 ff. Cf. this book chap. 6, text and nn. 28 fff.
26. Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristique latins," pp. 193-233. There are probably more exceptions than realized.
27. See Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro*, etc., esp. pp. 30, 159, 160, 239, 429, and C. Wendel, "Planudes," in *Byz. Zeit.* 40 (1940): 406-45.
28. For Calecas' treatise, see Migne PG, vol. 152, cols. 429-661, esp. cols. 536-53; cf. J. Gouillard, "Les influences latines dans l'oeuvre de M. Calecas," *Echos d'Orient* (1938), pp. 37-40.
29. Cf. esp. R. Loenertz, *Demetrius Cydonès Correspondance*, 2 vols. (1956-60); and Runciman, *Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 74-75.
30. Cf. views of Cydones himself in his "Autobiography," pp. 359-403 (Mercati, *Notizie*). See R. Loenertz, "Les établissements dominicains de Péra-Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient* 34 (1935): 332-49. See Loenertz, p. 82 and *Echos d'Orient* 34 (1935): 332. Cydones himself tells us that he wanted to learn Latin



- because when he was in charge of the imperial correspondence he found too many points garbled by the Greek translators. See his "Apologia," in Mercati, *Notizie*, pp. 359 ff. His words in Greek are: "ei me pros tas eteran apoblepetai glossas all'autos emauto hromen mathon latinizein." (Note the word *Latiniz-ing* here.) Also cf. *ibid.*, p. 162. See in addition G. Cammelli, *Démétrius Cydonès Correspondance* (Paris, 1930), pp. xv-xvii and 145-46.
31. See Cydonès, "Autobiography" (Mercati, *Notizie*, p. 159). Also, on the *filioque* and his translations from Thomas, see E. Bouvy, "Saint Thomas: Ses traducteurs byzantins," *Revue Augustinienne* 16 (1910): 404. The *De Potentia* (a *quaestio disputata* by Aquinas on the *filioque*) is no. 10, article 4. See now also S. Papadopoulos, *Hellenikai metaphraseis Thomistikon Ergon* (Athens, 1967; in Greek).
  32. See Mercati, *Notizie*, pp. 359-435, esp. 362.
  33. See Cydonès, in Mercati, *Notizie*, p. 159.
  34. See Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques," and also M. Rackl, "Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen," *Misc. F. Fhrle*, 1 (Rome, 1924): 1-38.
  35. On Margounios, see Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, pp. 165 ff. To these two names should be added that of Nicephoros Blemmydes of the thirteenth century.
  36. See my "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," chap. 3, p. 72, in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 3 (Madison, Wis., 1975). Also D. Zakythinos, "Démétrius Cydonès et l'entente Balkanique au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *La Grèce et les Balkans* (Athens, 1947). Important on Cydonès is R. Loenertz, "Lettre de Démétrius Cydonès à Andronic Oenéote Grand Juge des Romains (1369-1371)," *Revue des études byzantines* 29 (1971): 303-08.
  37. Cf. G. Mercati, Cydonès' "Apologia," pp. 362, ff. 366, 372, 389, 402; German trans. by H. G. Beck, "Die 'Apologia pro vita sua' des Demetrios Kydonès," *Ostkirchlichen Studien*, vol. 1 (1957).
  38. Text in Migne PG, vol. 154, cols. 952B. See G. Papadopoulos, "Byzantine Theology: Relations with the West" (in Greek) in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 3, p. 1095.
  39. For example, Papadopoulos, "Byzantine Theology," p. 1095. This is the standard Greek criticism of the *filioque*.
  40. Cf. also St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, pt. 1, 27; actually combined from Augustine, *De Trinitate*, bk. 6, chap. 10 (cf. bk. 15) and from Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, pt. 1, Q. 39: "potestas, sapientia, bonitas," but Thomas and Augustine equate *sapientia* with *verbum* (*logos*), and *bonitas* with *caritas*.
  41. On the Thomist circle, see esp. M. Jugie, "Démétrius Cydonès et la théologie latine à Byzance du XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Echos d'Orient* 31 (1928): 385-402. On Prochoros' work, see Mercati, *Notizie*, p. 287.
  42. For Calecas' works, see Migne PG, vol. 152, cols. 429-661. Cf. now W. Schmitt, "Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz," *Jahrb. Osterr. byz. Gesellschaft*, 17 (1968): 127-47, who questions the translation of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*.
  43. For text see Migne PG, vol. 152, esp. col. 568B.
  44. For Scholarius' summary of the Orthodox faith, see his "Contre Judaeos," *Oeuvres Complètes*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1928-30). On his opposition to both Cydonès and his pupil Calecas, see Mercati, *Notizie*, p. 449, n. 2, to the effect that



Cydones and Calecas had accepted Latin Christianity because they had been expelled from the Greek church on account of their attachment to doctrines of Barlaam and Acyndinos.

45. On Greek insistence on the convocation of an ecumenical council to debate union, see Geanakoplos, "Byzantium and the Later Crusades," chap. 3, pp. 90-92. Also M. Viller, "La question de l'union des églises entre Grecs et Latins," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 15 (1921): 260-305, 515-32, 18 (1920): 20-60; and D. Nicol, "Byzantine Requests for an Ecumenical Council in the 14th Century," *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969): 69-95.
46. See F. Masai, *Pléthon et le Platonisme de Mistra* (Paris, 1956), pp. 338-39 (original text edited in Paris in 1541).
47. On the presumed Greek inadequacy in debate, see the views of J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 228-29, who also cites the emperor's words (*Acta Graeca*, pp. 418, 421). On George Scholarius, see his *Opera* (Paris, 1928) 1: 299, where he complains that the Greeks no longer had qualifications to compete with the Latins. Cf. P. Sherrard, *Greek East and Latin West* (London, 1959) pp. 168 f. But now see S. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla. Umanesimo e teologia* (Florence, 1972), who discusses what Valla learned about exegetical methodology in Florence from Greeks. To support a theological interpretation, the Greek method was to present a "chain" of evidence from writings of the Fathers; the Latins, however, now generally used a "syllogistic" approach.
48. On Pletho, see esp. Masai, *Pléthon et le Platonisme de Mistra*, and also A. Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation: The Byzantine Period* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1970), esp. pp. 126-35. Also this book Prologue and Epilogue.
49. See Runciman, "Byzantine Linguists," *Prosfora to S. Kyriakidis* (1953), p. 577 (in Greek). Also Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, esp. pp. 1-4, for a summary of "national" Greek and Latin attitudes. Esp. see Pope Nicholas I's letter to the Byzantine court objecting to the Greeks' calling the Latin language "barbarian" (in F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* [Cambridge, 1948] pp. 105-09).
50. Michael Psellus, *Chronographia*, ed. E. Sewter (New Haven, 1953). According to Psellus, in his *De Omnifaria Doctrina*, ed. L. Westerink (1948), p. 90, he memorized the *Iliad* as a child.
51. See R. Henry, *Photius Bibliothèque* (Paris, 1959). Also Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques," pp. 208, 214-16, who shows that Photius mentions Augustine and Gregory the Great. Now see also P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1972).
52. For Latin knowledge of Greek Christian literature (up to the twelfth century), see A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinische Kirche* (Munich-Pasing, 1949).
53. I am told this by the palaeographer M. Naoumides, professor of Greek at the University of Illinois. Cf. above, chap. 3, n. 2.
54. See translation of F. Wright, *Liudprand of Cremona* (1930), "The Embassy to Constantinople," chap. 31: chap. 47.
55. On Constantine see above, n. 10.
56. On Petrus Hispanus see *Enciclopedia italiana* under that entry; also the curious work of C. Prantl, *Michael Psellus und Petrus Hispanus* (Leipzig, 1867). On Planudes' translations see above, n. 17; and now W. Schmitt, "Lateinische



- Literatur in Byzanz," *Jahrb. Osterr. byz. Gesellschaft* 17 (1968): 127-47. A. Turyn informs me that the view that Planudes translated Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* is false. The latest work on Planudes is P. Stadter, "Planudes, Plutarch and Pace of Ferrara," *Italia medievale e umanistica* 16 (1973): 137-62.
57. On Planudes in Venice (where he was sent precisely because of his fine knowledge of Latin), see Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 27 and n. 48; also Wendel in *Byz. Zeit.* 40 (1940): 406 ff.
  58. See esp. G. Mercati, *Notizie*, as cited above in n. 27. Also Stadter, p. 158.
  59. Moschopoulos' even more brilliant pupil was Marcus Musurus. On Moschopoulos, see Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, esp. pp. 23, 220, 286-88; and A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, Ill., 1959), passim. On other students of Planudes, see Stadter (above, n. 56), pp. 158, 139, mentioning John and Andronikas Zarides, and Planudes' class.
  60. See Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, bk. 4, who suggests using the classics but not enjoying them; St. Jerome also suggested the same thing, as later, in effect, did St. Basil in his famous "Discourse to the Youth on the Reading of Classical Literature." See below, chap. 14 and esp. Epilogue, n. 8, work of Wilson.
  61. See R. Henry, *Photius Bibliothèque* (Paris, 1959).
  62. On all these figures, see Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, and esp. E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique . . . au XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles*, vols. 1-2 (Paris, 1935 ff.). Esp. cf. below, chap. 13.
  63. D. Geanakoplos, "A Byzantine Looks at the Renaissance: The Attitude of Michael Apostolis Toward the Rise of Italy to Cultural Eminence," *Greek and Byzantine Studies* 1 (1958): 157-62.
  64. For influences of medieval Latin romances on Byzantine literature, see below, chap. 3.
  65. See below, chap. 13, text and note that indicates Demetrius Chalcondyles' reference to the *Divine Comedy* of Dante.
  66. See Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation*, pp. 241-45, esp. 244, quoting Bessarion's words that Greek youth should learn the techniques of Italian engineering (ironworking) and shipbuilding to help the Greek nation. See below, Epilogue.
  67. N. Kalogeras, *Markos Eugenikos and Cardinal Bessarion* (Athens, 1893), p. 70, prints a quotation from Joseph Bryennius (from 1400, published in Leipzig in 1478) which reads: "Do not be deceived . . . If Latin allied troops come to aid us against the Turks they will take arms in order to destroy our city, our race, and our name" (earlier quoted here in Prologue).
  68. On the period of Turkish domination in Greece, see below, chap. 9; also T. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels, 1952); and S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 168, 208 ff.

## Notes to Chapter 5

1. Eusebius, *Laus Constantini*, *Eusebius Werke*, ed. I. A. Heikel, 1 (Leipzig, 1902): 199. For the importance of Eusebius in Byzantine political theory, see D.



- Geanakoplos, "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism," *Church History* 34 (1965): 385. On Eusebius' political thought, see esp. N. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* 2 (1933-34): 13-18; E. Schwartz, *Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche* (Leipzig, 1936); F. Cranz, "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea," *Harvard Theological Review* (1952), p. 47-66; cf. Ph. Sherrard, *Greek East and Latin West* (London, 1959), pp. 92 ff.
2. On this problem, see Geanakoplos, "Church and State," 385 ff. with bibliography. See also K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude Towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to The Emperor* (New York, 1941), pp. 48 ff., 79 ff.
  3. G. T. Armstrong, "Imperial Church Building and Church-State Relations, A.D. 313-63," *Church History* 36 (1967): 3-17. On views of the work of Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, see below passim, especially n. 19. Also recently, R. MacMullen, *Constantine* (New York, 1969), pp. 211 ff.
  4. N. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (London, 1932), p. 29.
  5. Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, ed. Bekker (Bonn, 1837), pp. 97 ff., mentions the temple of the Dioskouroi and the Tycheion. Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* (Migne, PG 67 [Paris 1864], col. 409), notes that Emperor Julian worshipped the image of Tyche in a building called a *basilike*. For Constantine's temple in Umbria, see *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* XI.2.1. 5265. This inscription from Hispellum, dating from the last year of his reign, prohibits the use of the temple for pagan worship. See also A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (New York, 1962), pp. 89, 175.
  6. On Marme, see Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* (*Eusebius Werke*, ed. Heikel, 1 [Leipzig, 1902]: 99-104, where Eusebius tells of the order to build a church building in place of the pagan altar at Marme, and mentions the destruction of temples at Aphaca on Mt. Lebanon in Phoenicia and at Aegae in Cilicia. He also reports that a shrine of Aphrodite was removed from the location where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was built (pp. 89 f.).
  7. *Vita Constantini*, pp. 104 f.
  8. *Codex Theodosianus*, 9.16. 1-2 and 16.10.2, ed. T. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer, in *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis* (Berlin, 1905), I.1, 459 f. and I.2, 879. Cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, pp. 59 f. and 98.
  9. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, pp. 101 f.; also Eusebius, *Laus Constantini*, p. 216.
  10. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, pp. 60 f. For Constantine's own views, see a letter recorded by Eusebius in *Vita Constantini*, pp. 61 f., and his edict preserved by Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte*, ed. min. (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 388-91.
  11. Eusebius, *Laus Constantini*, p. 220, indicates that one aspect of the emperor's task was to foster unity by constructing houses of prayer. Baynes, *Constantine the Great* (supra, n. 4) pp. 12-30, convincingly argues that the necessity for ecclesiastical unity was a determining factor in Constantine's religious policy.
  12. Letter of Constantine to Celsus, his Vicar of Africa, in *S. Optati Milevitani libri VII*, ed. C. Ziwsa, in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, 26 (Vienna, 1893): 211-12 (app. 7).



13. A fine survey of these documents is found in Baynes, *Constantine the Great*, pp. 12-17, with notes. Cf. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, pp. 91-104, who labels Constantine's emerging attitude "Caesaropapism" (p. 103).
14. Letter of Augustine to Januarius, in *S. Aurelii Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, 34 (Vienna, 1895): 408 f. Jones, pp. 104 ff., suggests that the order for confiscation was revoked after about three months, early in 321. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, pp. 112 f., records part of an edict designed to remove from heretical control every building used as a place of prayer. Neither Donatists nor Arians are mentioned in this context, but Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Paulianists are (p. 111).
15. Letter of Constantine to the bishops of Numidia, in *S. Optati Milevitani* pp. 213-16 (app. 10).
16. *Ibid.*, p. 215 (app. 10).
17. On Constantine's motives for building, see Eusebius, *Laus Constantini*, pp. 220 f., 224, 259, and n. 24 below. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, pp. 131 f. also tells of Constantine's order for fifty copies of the Holy Scriptures, to meet the needs of the growing number of churches. On Constantine's enlarging of existing churches, see text for n. 21 below.
18. The best recent study of Constantine's churches is by L. Voelkl, *Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts* (Cologne and Opladen, 1964). Cf. G. T. Armstrong, "Imperial Church Building in the Holy Land in the 4th Century," *Bibl. Arch.* 30 (1969): 90-102, and his related "Church and State Relations. The Changes Wrought by Constantine," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 32 (1964): 1-7.
19. I accept the view of A. H. M. Jones, who holds the *Vita Constantini* to be a reliable source and an authentic work of Eusebius: see his recent "Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius' Life of Constantine," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 196-200. See also Baynes (*supra*, n. 4) pp. 40-49, who is in essential agreement with Jones, although he holds that the *Vita Constantini* "never received final revision at its author's hands" (p. 49); and G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: A Contribution to the Criticism of the *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951): 58-72, who holds that certain problematic passages in the *Vita* are later interpolations in an otherwise reliable and authentic work. Cf. the most radical view of the *Vita Constantini* by H. Grégoire, "Eusebe n'est pas l'auteur de la *Vita Constantini* dans sa forme Actuelle et Constantin n'est pas converti en 312," *Byzantion* 13 (1938): 561 ff.
20. *Vita Constantini*, pp. 91 f. On the churches of Constantine in Palestine, see J. W. Crowfoot, *Early Churches in Palestine* (London, 1941).
21. For this famous passage, see *Vita Constantini*, p. 60. On the heightening and enlarging of existing church buildings, see L. Voelkl, "Die konstantinischen Kirchenbauten nach Eusebius," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 29 (1953): 60-64.
22. The question of the origin of the basilica has produced considerable literature with very varied interpretations. See especially J. B. Ward Perkins, "Con-



- stantine and the Origins of the Christian Basilica," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 22 (1954): 69-90, and W. MacDonald, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (New York, 1962), with bibliography. See also E. Swift, *Roman Sources of Christian Art* (New York, 1951). For a short survey of opinions, see W. Lowrie, *Art in the Early Church* (New York, 1947), pp. 87-110.
23. *Vita Constantini*, pp. 101-04, and *Laus Constantini*, p. 216. The practice of opening the temples for public inspection and even displaying the contents was revived in Theodosius I's day: see Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. J. Bidez (Berlin, 1960), pp. 319 ff.
  24. For the use of the term *basilike* to apply to secular imperial structures before Constantine's conversion, see the survey by Ward Perkins (above, n. 22), pp. 69-76 with notes, and Swift (above, n. 22), pp. 9-30. Cf. L. Voelkl (above, n. 21), pp. 60 ff. We mention here terms applied by Eusebius to early church buildings, some already noted, others unemphasized. For example, for usages of *ekklesia*, *efkterios neos*, and *efktenos oikos*, see *Vita Constantini*, pp. 98-99; for *prosefktion*, see *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Schwartz, p. 370; and for the first occurrence of *kyriakon oikeion*, see *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Schwartz, p. 363. The church building in Tyre, dedicated ca. 314 (see Setton [above n. 2], p. 44) is referred to in Eusebius' panegyric as a *basileios oikos* (*Ecclesiastical History*, p. 381). See also n. 5 above. Constantine's churches in the Holy Land are characterized by Eusebius as *basilikes dianoiias basilika megalourgemata* ("imperial monuments of an imperial spirit"), who calls them trophies to the victory of the heavenly Basileus (*Leus Constantini*, pp. 220, 224, esp. 259). On the basilica in general, see R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Harmondsworth, 1965) and esp. his (with S. Corbett and W. Frank) *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, vol. 4 (Vatican, 1970).
  25. Setton, *Christian Attitude* (above, n. 2), pp. 53 ff., 71 ff., and n. 26 below.
  26. On the attitudes of Constantine's contemporaries, see Setton, pp. 40 ff., and n. 30 below. On Constantine's benefactions to the bishops, see, for example, the documents preserved in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 394-95.
  27. See sources cited above in nn. 6, 10, and 23 for Constantine's attitude toward the pagans; also his letter to the Persian king on behalf of Christians, in Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, p. 121. On Constantine's view of his proselytizing as a duty, see Baynes, *Constantine the Great*, pp. 25 ff.
  28. See Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches*, 1 (Vienna, 1928): 226 f. and Setton, *Christian Attitude*, pp. 71 ff.
  29. Setton, p. 82.
  30. Cf. G. H. Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," *Church History* 20 (1951): no. 3, pp. 8-14 and no. 4, pp. 15 ff. The statement from Athanasius is found in his *Historia Arianorum*, MPG, 25 (Paris, 1884), col. 729.
  31. On the mosaics of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and San Vitale, see O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 350 ff. and esp. 358 ff. (on the various interpretations of the San Vitale mosaics), and A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (Geneva, 1953), pp. 52 ff. and esp. 68 (on San Vitale). For a comparison between Arian and Orthodox ornamentation, see views of W. Fleming, *Arts and Ideas* (New York, 1963), p. 146.
  32. MPG, 67, cols. 380-81.



- [illegible]



- Gaza (Paris, 1930), pp. 44, 71. See also M. Avi-Yonah, "The Economics of Byzantine Palestine," *Israel Exploration Journals* 8 (1958): 42, and G. Downey, *Gaza in the Early Sixth Century* (Norman, Okla., 1963), pp. 22 ff.
48. Mark the Deacon, *Life of Porphyry*, ed. Grégoire and Kugener, p. 35. In their introduction (pp. xliii-xliv), the editors compare the use of *eugnomenos* ("to be of good feeling") regarding the willingness of the people of Gaza to pay their taxes, with the term *eugnomyne* ("loyalty"), used by Justinian regarding the loyalty of the people of Caesarea—see his Novel 103 (in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll 3 [Berlin, 1912], pp. 469-70). Arcadius' hesitation to destroy the Marneion in the center of the city was in line with a general policy to secularize rather than destroy all city temples (see above, n. 42).
  49. Evagrius, *Eccl. Hist.*, MPG, 86.2 (Paris, 1865), cols. 2469, 2472, mentions churches in Antioch named for Rufinus, Prefect of the East under Theodosius I; for Zoilus and Callistus, each at one time *Consularis* of Syria; and for Anatolius, a *strategos*. See also M. Avi-Yonah, "Economics of Byzantine Palestine," pp. 43 ff. and 50-51 for a list of private benefactors in Palestine.
  50. Avi-Yonah, p. 44. Evagrius, *Eccl. Hist.*, PG 86.2, cols. 2476-84.
  51. P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius I* (Madison, Wis., 1939), p. 12.
  52. M. Anastos, "Justinian's Despotism Control over the Church as Illustrated by his Edict on Theopaschite Formula and Letter to Pope John in 533," *Zbor. Rad. Viz. Inst.*, no. 312 (= *Mélanges Ostrogorsky*, 2 [1964]: 1-11). See Geanakoplos, "Church and State," pp. 392-94, 397-98.
  53. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2: 23 ff., 360 ff., and 392. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-empire* (Paris, 1949), 2: 278-79. See now W. Frend, "Old and New Rome in the Age of Justinian," in *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D. Baker (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 11-29.
  54. W. Ensslin, "The Emperor and the Imperial Administration," *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization*, ed. N. Baynes and H. Moss (Oxford, 1961), p. 275, points out that both Theodosius II and Justinian were greeted as *archierefs* and that Marcian was acclaimed *hierefs* and *basileus* at the Council of Chalcedon.
  55. See Geanakoplos, "Church and State," pp. 390-92, with bibliography (citing Mitard and Diehl). As Procopius puts it, *De Aedificiis*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 6, Justinian closed all paths leading to error and established religion firmly upon a single foundation of the faith.
  56. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History*, PG 86.2, cols. 2736-37. See n. 58 below for the churches in that area specifically mentioned by Procopius.
  57. MacDonald, (*supra*, n. 22), p. 32, and Fleming, (*supra*, n. 31), p. 147. Cf. Bury, (*supra*, n. 42), 2: 284 f.
  58. Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 185. In addition to the church at Septum, modern Ceuta, five churches at Leptis Magna, modern Lebda (p. 177), a church at Sabratha, modern Tripoli Vecchia (p. 178), and two churches and a monastery at Carthage are mentioned (p. 180). A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 1 (Madison, 1964): 138 f., mentions archaeco-

- log
- Cr
59. Se
- fift
- the
- Pro
- ed.
- chu
- shr
- In
- shri
- Do
- Pro
- in t
- mer
- Wir
- ing
- chu
- Sixt
- Revi
60. E. E
- pp.
- expr
- and
- and
- Chri
- Swif
- Serg
- Anth
- that
- the e
- impo
- Flem
61. Paul
- 489-9
- "the
62. Ed. E
63. Const
- poiled
- Wirth
64. Justin
- Bandu
- God ca
- stantin
65. Paulu
66. Procop



logical evidence of apparently Justinianic churches in Spain and in the Crimea (at Dory).

59. See Bury, 2: 371. These churches were built in Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria; fifty-five were paid for by the imperial treasury and forty-one were built by the proselytes out of their own funds. Two monasteries were also built. Procopius makes no attempt to list all Justinian's buildings (see *Aedificiis*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 38, 186); yet he does name or imply the presence of church building(s) at over seventy different sites. Twelve of the churches or shrines mentioned were dedicated to the *theotokos* (*loc. cit.*, p. 20, and *passim*). In Constantinople and the adjoining areas he built over twenty new churches, shrines, and sanctuaries, and rebuilt or enlarged over half that many. Cf. G. Downey, *Constantinople in the Days of Justinian* (Norman, Okla., 1960), p. 100. Procopius' statement (*Aedificiis*, p. 34) that no churches were built anywhere in the empire *without* imperial sanction, should be read in the light of statements in his *Historia Arcana* (original title, *Anekdotai*), ed. J. Haury and G. Wirth, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* (Leipzig, 1963) 3: 158 f., 164, regarding the emperor's many exactions and control over local spending. On churches built in the Holy Land in this period, see G. Armstrong, "Fifth and Sixth Century Church Building in the Holy Land," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 14 (1969): 17-30.
60. E. B. Smith, *The Dome: A Study in the History of Ideas* (Princeton, 1950), esp. pp. 77 ff. Procopius, *Aedificiis*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 30, writes that Justinian expressed his gratitude for a miraculous cure received from Saints Cosmas and Damian, the Christian counterparts of Castor and Pollux, by rebuilding and enlarging their shrine at Constantinople. The association between the Christian saints and the pagan twins is also suggested by Bury, 1: 373. Cf. Swift, (*supra*, n. 22), pp. 80-84, 107-08, who argues that the domes of St. Sergius and Bacchus and St. Sophia were inspired by domes in Rome which Anthemius of Tralles is supposed to have studied. There seems little doubt that the imagery of the dome suggesting heaven, and the analogy between the emperor's authority over the earth with that of God in heaven, was important in Justinian's adoption of the dome for St. Sophia. See especially Fleming's statement, n. 71 below.
61. Paulus Silentiarius, *Descriptio S. Sophiae*, ed. Bekker (Bonn, 1837), p. 25, ll. 489-91. Note also ll. 529 f. (p. 27) where the dome is described by the words "the roof rises like a beautiful high-crowned helmet."
62. Ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 8.
63. Constantine had despoiled temples: see above, nn. 6 and 23. Justinian despoiled Arian churches, according to Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 3: 72 ff.
64. Justinian's words are recorded in an anonymous account preserved by Banduri and other editors: see *Relation on the Construction of the Great Church of God called St. Sophia* (in Greek), § 27, ed. T. Preger, *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, 1 (Leipzig, 1901): 105.
65. Paulus Silentiarius, *Descriptio S. Sophiae*, ed. Bekker (Bonn, 1837), p. 3, l. 2.
66. Procopius, *Aedificiis*, 4: 55.



67. G. Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," *Byz. Zeit.*, 38 (1938): 1-11, esp. 10 and n. 3.
68. Procopius, *Aedificiis (Peri Ktismaton)*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 4: 134, concludes his discussion here of all Justinian's buildings (*ktiseis*) in Constantinople, ecclesiastical and secular.
69. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, ed. Reiske (Bonn, 1830), p. 521. See also E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae* (Berkeley, 1946), p. 50.
70. Procopius, *Aedificiis*, 4: 92.
71. G. Armstrong (supra, n. 3) for the term "propaganda" follows the usage of B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 1 (Berlin, 1960): 139-45. Fleming (supra, n. 31), pp. 171 f., suggests that centralized churches like San Vitale and St. Sophia, with their "sharp hierarchical divisions that set aside a place for men and women, clergy and laity, aristocrat and commoner, were admirably suited to convey the principle of imperial authority [such structures inspired an attitude of reverence] not only to God, but also to His viceroys on earth. . . . The majesty of God was felt through the infinite power of government. . . . Both spiritual and secular authority were imposed on man from above [fostering his acceptance of] the unified ideal of one Christian empire with one church, one emperor, and one body of laws." See also n. 67 above.
72. *Historia Arcana*, ed. Haury-Wirth, 3: 51, 120-21, and esp. 162.
73. *Codex Justinianus*, 1.17.1, ed. Krueger, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3: 69. For further analysis of Byzantine church-state ideology, see my *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 33, 86, 96 ff; cf. G. Mathew, *Byzantine Aesthetics* (London, 1963), esp. pp. 59-64, 86, and 93, which deals peripherally with some questions discussed in this chapter. Also now see S. Runciman, *Byzantine Style and Civilization* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1975).

#### Notes to Chapter 6

1. H. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), pp. 436 and 91. Cf. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 1: 231 "[Maximos] was one of the most remarkable Byzantine theologians." (It should be noted that some would perhaps call Gregory Palamas the last really outstanding Byzantine theologian.) Eastern works on Maximos are by E. von Ivanka, *Maximus der Bekenner: all-eins in Christus* (Einsiedeln, 1961), with excerpts from the earlier *Ambigua* and *Ad Thallasium*; V. Grümel, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie sur la vie de S. Maxime," *Echos d'Orient* 26 (1927): 24-32, and his "Maxime de Chrysopolis," *Dict. Theol. Cath.* 10: 448-59; H. Beck, *idem*, pp. 330, 353, 357, *passim*; A. Brilliantoff, *The Influence of Eastern Theology on Western as Evidenced by Works of John Scotus Erigena* (St. Petersburg, 1898; in Russian); S. Epifanovic, *Materials to Serve in the Study of the Life and Works of St. Maximus the Confessor* (Kiev, 1917; in Russian); I. Hausherr, *Philautie, de la tendresse pour soi à la charité selon S. Maxime le Confesseur* (Rome, 1952); "Massimo il Confessore," in *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, 8 (1952): 307; article on him in (Greek) *Religious and Ethical Encyclopedia*, 8,



col. 614-24. I. H. Dalmais, at the Oxford Patristic Congress (1963), established a connection between Maximus and Erigena. See also H. Dalmais, "Place de la mystagogie de St. Maximus le Confesseur dans la théologie liturgique byzantine," *Studia Patristica* 5 (1963): 277-83. I. Zizoulias, Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University (1964), on the Christology of Maximus; M. Candal, "La gracia increada del 'Liber Ambiguum' de San Maximo," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 27 (1961): 38-45, and J. Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Washington, D.C., 1967), chap. 7.

Other significant works in whole or in part on Maximus, esp. by westerners, are (most importantly) by P. Sherwood, *St. Maximus the Confessor, The Ascetic Life, The Four Centuries on Charity* (London, 1955); his "Survey of Recent Work on St. Maximus the Confessor," *Traditio* 20 (1964): 428-37; J. Dräseke, "Maximus Confessor und Johannes Scotus Erigena," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 84 (1911): 20-60; M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène* (Louvain-Paris, 1933); B. Altaner, "Die Kenntnis der Griechischen in den Missionsorden während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur vorgegeschichte des Humanismus," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 13 (1934); E. Gilson, *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard*, trans. A. Downes (New York-London, 1940), esp. pp. 25-28; and, most recently, J. Pelikan, "Council or Father or Scripture: The Concept of Authority in the Theology of Maximus Confessor," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 195 (1973): 277-88.

2. The view is often expressed that Maximus "put Christ at the center of Dionysian thought."
3. Anna Comnena says the court of her father Alexius read Maximus: E. Dawes trans. of *Alexiad* (New York, 1967), p. 135. On Symeon, "the New Theologian," see *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London, 1958), p. 1256. Pachymeres is, after Maximus, the most important Byzantine paraphraser of and commentator on Dionysius. He wrote a *paraphrasis* on Dionysius' epistles: *MPG*, 4, cols. 433 ff. The *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London, 1958), p. 403, says Pachymeres and Andrew of Crete wrote commentaries on Dionysius. For other influences, see P. Sherwood, "Survey of Recent Work on Maximus the Confessor," *Traditio* 20 (1964): 435 ff. On Nicholas Cabasilas, see his *Explication de la divine liturgie*, trans. and notes by S. Salaville Paris, 1967 (*Sources chrétiennes*, no. 4). On Cyprisites, see below.
4. He wrote scholia to the four great works of Dionysius, and to his epistles, plus a prologue and glossary of terms used by Dionysius, *MPG*, vol. 4. It should be noted that the scholia on Dionysius attributed by Western scholars to Maximus the Confessor, were in part the work of Maximus' near contemporary, John of Scythopolis (see esp. H. U. von Balthasar, "Das Scholien Werk des Johannes von Skythopolis," *Scholastik* 15 (1940): 16 ff.
5. *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 7: 1073, under John Scotus Erigena by L. Lynch, says Erigena's translation of the *Ambigua* of Maximus consisted of a preface, two poems, and sixty-seven chapters, of which only the first five and the beginning of six have been printed. On the *Earlier Ambigua*, see Sherwood, "The Earlier Ambigua of Maximus," *Studia Anselmiana* 36 (1935): 1-22; M. Cappuyns, "La 'Versie Ambiguum Maximus' de Jean Scot Erigena,"



- Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 30 (1963): 324-29, and his "Gloss inédite de Jean Scot sur un passage de Maximi," idem, 31 (1964): 320-24.
6. Erigena translated into Latin the four great mystical works of Dionysius. At the Oxford Congress (1963) Dom Meyvaert announced (see *Sacris Erudiri* 14 [1963]: 130-48) the discovery of a translation of Maximos' *Ad Thalassium* by Scotus Erigena. See more recently, M. Cappuyns, "Jean Scot Erigène et les 'Scholia' de Maxime le Confesseur," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 31 (1964): 122-24.
  7. See Dondaine (cited in n. 15). Anastasius, in fact, preserved in Latin a fragment of a letter of Maximos sent to a certain Peter concerning the primacy of the pope; see *MPG*, 91, cols. 141-44. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1897), p. 63, says Maximos is known in the West as "The Interpreter" of Dionysius.
  8. In *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard* (New York-London, 1940), p. 25, E. Gilson says Bernard was influenced by Dionysius through Maximos in Erigena's translation. Gilson says Bonaventure was also influenced by Maximos. The *Dict. Theol. Cath.*, 7 pt. 1, col. 246 (under Hughes de Saint-Victor), says Dionysius is mentioned twice in Hughes, who wrote a commentary on the *Celestial Hierarchy*. See also on the *Theologia Mystica*, M. Honecker, "Nikolaus von Cues und die griechische sprache." *Sitz. Heidelb. Akad. Wissen., Phil., Hist. Kl.*, 28 (1938): 26, n. 92. Cerbanus, the twelfth-century Western monk, knew the *Centuries on Charity*. See n. 57 below.
  9. Albert the Great wrote commentaries on Dionysius' *Celestial Hierarchy*, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, *Mystical Theology*, and *Epistles*. Doubtless he must have read the Anastasian corpus. I can find no record of Albert's use of the *Ambigua*. But see J. Bach, *Des Albertus Magnus Verhältniss zu der Erkenntnisslehre der Griechen, Lateiner, Araber, und Juden* (Vienna, 1881).
  10. See A. Pegis, ed., *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 2 (New York, 1945), index of authors, p. 1174 under Maximos (esp. concerning angels, their intellectual powers, and their nature, vols. 1-2, pp. 50, 6, Obj. 1 and Obj. 2).
  11. D. A. Callus, ed., *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 34, 56-57. See E. Francheschini, "Grosseteste's translation of the Prologos and Scholia of Maximos to the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34 (1933): 353-63, esp. 356-57. Francheschini states that Grosseteste did not know these scholia were by Maximos. Anastasius Bibliothecarius had translated them and sent them with a dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald in 865. No evidence shows that Grosseteste knew this version. R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 243, suggests a strong influence of Dionysius (perhaps of Maximos too) on Pico and Ficino.
  12. On Nicholas and Balbus, see below. As noted above, Maximos is important to the West as the interpreter of Pseudo-Dionysius.
  13. See W. Sparrow-Simpson, in C. Rolt, ed., *Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology* (SPCK: New York, 1951), p. 203, who says that the Greek writings of Dionysius were sent to the Gallican church in 757 by Pope Pascal and remained unread for nearly a century in the abbey of



St. Denys until Charles the Bald asked Erigena to translate them into Latin (all four principal works). Cf. Dondaine p. 25, n. 15, who says this is not historically corroborated, and that the first exemplar of Dionysius we can trace is the one sent from Byzantium by Emperor Michael II.

14. P. Sherwood, *St. Maximus the Confessor* (in *Ancient Christian Writers*, no. 21), pp. 24-28. Also see his article cited in *Studia Anselmiana* 30 (1952): 1-22.
15. H. Dondaine, in *Le Corpus Dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Rome 1953), pp. 25-26, says Hilduin probably had the MS of Dionysius (which had lain there unread in its library for a time) read by someone who knew Greek, then translated orally by another into Latin, and finally written down by still another. Inevitably, then, many errors occurred, making for a very faulty translation.
16. Maximus probably used Dionysius' thought in order to comment on Gregory of Nazianzus. Erigena may have also translated *Ad Thalassium*. See n. 6, above.
17. See *Versio Maximi*, *MPL*, vol. 122, cols. 1193 ff., esp. 1195A: "nisi viderem, praefatum beatissimum Maximum saepissime in processu sui operis obscurissimas sanctissimi theologi Dionysii Areopagitae sententias, ejus symbolicos theologicosque sensus nuper Vobis similiter jubentibus transtuli, . . . quae illuminat abscondita tenebrarum." Also see M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène, Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Paris-Louvain, 1933), p. 162.
18. *MPL*, v. 122, cols. 1027-28; also H. Bett, *Johannes Scotus Erigena*, (Cambridge, 1925), p. 17.
19. See *MPL*, vol. 122, cols. 1194 D-1195 A: "hoc est intellectu difficilium . . . de Graeco in Latinum vobis jubentibus edidi, etc." Cf. Bett, *Erigena*, p. 17, n. 2.
20. *MPL*, v. 122, col. 1197D (footnote of Latin text no. D); cf. Bett, *Erigena*, p. 17, n. 2. J. Dräseke, article cited above, n. 1, commenting on Erigena's Greek, says it was easier for him to read Gregory of Nyssa than Maximus because the latter's style and thoughts are more difficult.
21. From *MPG*, vol. 91, col. 1113 B. Cf. H. Bett, *Erigena*, pp. 24-25. Cf. Erigena's quotation from Maximus (*MPL*, vol. 122, col. 494C, *De Divisione Naturae*. . . : "ut ait Maximus, humanus intellectus ascendit per caritatem, in tantum divina sapientia descendit per misericordiam." See T. Gregory, "Note sulla dottrina della 'teofanie' in Giovanni Scoto Eriugena," *Studi Medievali*, ser. 3, vol. 4, pt. 1, pp. 75-91. See also Gilson's book on Bernard, *Mystical Theology of St. Bernard*, (cited in n. 1), esp. pp. 25-28.
22. Summarized in Bett, *Erigena*, p. 25, from *MPL*, Erigena's *De Divisione Naturae*, vol. 122, col. 451.
23. Maximus' *Ambigua*, *MPG*, vol. 191, cols. 1285-88.
24. See *MPL*, *Erigena*, vol. 518A, and *MPG*, vol. 91, Maximus' *Ambigua*, col. 1185B.
25. *MPG*, vol. 90, col. 672C, and *MPG*, vol. 91, col. 136B, where Maximus formulated the term *dia tou uiou*. Cf. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, pp. 308 ff. On the Council of Florence and views on the "procession," see D. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 99-102, and J. Gill, *Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 151-52, 212-13, etc; and



- on Margounios and Maximos the Confessor, see Geanakoplos, *idem*, esp. p. 171, and also F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1966), pp. 12-13.
26. See preceding note, esp. based on Maximos' phrase *dia tou uiou*. Also Bett, *Erigena*, pp. 30, 108 and n. 5. Unlike Augustine and Tertullian, Erigena did not use *a patre per filium*. (*De Trin*, 15: 48, and *Adversus Praxeam*, p. 4).
  27. See D. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, p. 171. Also cf. G. Fedalto, *Massimo Margounio e la sua opera per conciliare la sentenza degli orientali e dei latini sulla processione dello Spirito Sancto* (Padua, 1961) p. 51, and his *Massimo Margounio e il suo commento al De Trinitate di S. Agostino* (Brescia, 1968). Cf. now A. Papadakes, "Gregory II of Cyprus and an unpublished report to the Synod," *Greek Roman Byzantine Studies* 16 (1975): 227-28, for similar usage.
  28. See A. Mercati, "Giovanni Ciparissiota alla corte di Gregorio XI," *Byz. Zeit.*, 30 (1929/30): 496-501, and B. Dentakis, *John Cyparissiotēs, the Wise, and the Philosopher* (Atens, 1965; in Greek). Also on Cyparissiotēs, Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, pp. 330, 727, 738, 749 ff., 789.
  29. Latin title (given by editor Turrianus) is *Expositio materiaria eorum quae de Deo a theologis dicuntur, in decem decades partita*: MPG, vol. 152, cols. 737 ff. His earlier work is his "Against the Errors of the Palamites" (for Latin title see MPG, vol. 152, cols. 663 ff., given by ed. Fr. Combefisius, *Palamiticorum Transgressionum liber primus*).
  30. B. Dentakis, *John Cyparissiotēs, The Wise, and the Philosopher* (Athens, 1965), pp. 62 ff., esp. 67 (in Greek). H. Beck, *Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Rome, 1937), *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 114: 171-75, demonstrates a doctrinal relationship between Cyparissiotēs and the commentators of Dionysius. The ten Decades of Cyparissiotēs take up the symbolic and negative theology of the East from Clement of Alexandria to Dionysius and his commentators.
  31. B. Dentakis, *The Nine Hymns to the Logos of God Attributed to John Cyparissiotēs* (Athens, 1964; in Greek), p. 13 ff.\* (asterik is part of page number in Dentakis' book); and MPG, vol. 152, col. 741-992.
  32. MPG, vol. 152, col. 746.
  33. See e.g. MPG, vol. 152, col. 751: "Quod symbolicae theologiae quae in specie sub sensum cadente versatur."
  34. MPG, vol. 152, col. 767A, chap. 4.
  35. See MPG, vol. 90, col. 1083, with slightly inverted word order in Latin: "Capita ducenta ad theologiam Deique Filii in carne dispensationem spectantia."
  36. Cyparissiotēs in MPG, vol. 152, col. 767.
  37. Beck (see n. 30).
  38. MPG, vol. 152, col. 778 (cf. n. 1 of scholia) taken from Maximos' *Ambigua*.
  39. Quoting from Maximus' work in explanation of Gregory Nazianzenus, MPG, vol. 152, col. 778.
  40. MPG, col. 152, col. 887A-B.
  41. MPG, vol. 152, col. 899; pasage taken from Maximos' work on *Centuries on Theology*, chap. 35, col. 1094, with slightly altered wording.



42. From MPG, vol. 152, col. 956C. Taken from Maximos, *Centuria* 4, cap. 1.
43. MPG, vol. 152, col. 959A.
44. On the originality of Cyparissiotēs, see in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique*, 18 (Paris, 1964), col. 314.
45. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, p. 739. B. Dentakis, *The Nine Hymns to the Logos of God Attributed to John Cyparissiotēs* (Athens, 1964), p. 13 (in Greek).
46. See Bett, *Erigena*, p. 11.
47. MPL, vol. 122, col. 1194B.
48. P. Sherwood, "Survey of Recent Work on Maximus the Confessor," *Traditio* 20 (1964): 438 ff.
49. See Bett, *Erigena*, p. 192.
50. I find no mention of Nicholas' use of Maximos in M. Honecker, *Nikolaus von Cues und die griechische Sprache* (cited above), pp. 26-27, though there are many mentions of Dionysius and translations of him in Hugh of St. Victor, Grossteste, and Thomas Gallo. (It seems that Nicholas brought back from Constantinople a Greek MS of Dionysius the Areopagite).
51. See Bett, *Nicholas of Cusa*, p. 93, n. 4. But this is Bett's only mention of Balbus, who had dedicated to Cusanus his translation of Alcinoos, *Epitome of Plato*.
52. D. Konstaninos, "Krētikē analisis tēs meletēs tou M. Reding: Die Aktualität des N. Cusanus" (Berlin, 1964), *Theologia* (in Greek) 3 (1966): 138 ff.
53. M. de Gandillac, *Nikolaus von Cues* (Düsseldorf, 1953), pp. 250-51. See the *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 5: 379, on the MS of Balbus's Latin translations of Maximos. According to an indirect testimony of Ughelli, there should be other MSS at the Biblioteca Capitolare of Capua, an unspecified sermon of Maximos and forty chapters of Maximos' *De caritate* (instead of the eighteen of the Florence MS). V. Capialbi, *Mémoire per servire alla storia della santa chiesa tropeana* (Naples, 1952), p. 36, cites Ughelli (*Italia Sacra*) as noting that in the Tesoro of Capua Cathedral are MSS with Balbus's translations from Greek to Latin, including "s. Maximi Sermo per dialogum ad Sixtum IV." Pietro Balbus studied Greek, incidentally, with the famous Vittorino da Feltre.
54. E. Van Steenbergh, *Le Cardinal Nicolas de Cues* (Paris, 1920), and M. de Gandillac, *Nikolaus von Cues* (Düsseldorf, 1953), esp. p. 288, where it is suggested that the words *unitas* and *entitas* correspond to the unusual Greek term *ontotes* to be found in Maximos' *Cent. gnost.* 1: 48 (MPG, vol. 90, 1101B). But Gandillac does not specifically say that Nicholas knew Maximos' work.
55. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, p. 436.
56. B. Dentakis, *John Cyparissiotēs, The Wise, and the Philosopher* (Athens, 1965) p. 69 (in Greek).
57. Cerbanus's translation of *De Caritate* (Cerbanus, a Venetian, lived for a time in Constantinople), is an interesting example of the twelfth-century revival of Greek thought in the West (P. Sherwood, *St. Maximus the Confessor*, pp. 101-02). Cerbanus also apparently was the first to make even a partial translation of John of Damascus: N. M. Haring SAC, *The First Traces of the So-Called Cerbanus translation of St. John Damascene 'De Fide Orthodoxa,'* 3: 1-8, in *Medieval Studies* 12 (1950): 214-16. Cf. E. Gilson, *History of Christian*



- Philosophy*, p. 600; and on Cerbanus, also see my chap. 3, above, text and n. 29.
58. Ficino's translation of Dionysius was completed in 1492 (P. Kristeller, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* [New York, 1943], p. 18). Thomas Gallus did a paraphrase of Dionysius, not a translation. John Sarazenus's famous translation of Dionysius did not include a new translation of Maximos' scholia on Dionysius.

## Notes to Chapter 7

1. Along with Epirus and Trebizond.
2. George Acropolites, *Opera*, ed. A. Heisenberg (Leipzig, 1903), 1: 98 (hereafter cited as Acrop.).
3. George Sphrantzes, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1838), p. 9. Cf. more recent edition of J. Papadopoulos, *Chronikon*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1935).
4. Demetrios Chomatianos, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio*, ed. J. Pitra (Paris, 1891), 7: 389-90.
5. *Byzantinon bios kai politismos* (Athens, 1949), 3:356 ff., and 357 n. (in Greek). G. Glotz, *L'Ordealie dans la Grèce Primitive* (thesis, Paris, 1904), p. 109, states that the ancient Greek ordeal "existait encore dans la période byzantine." However, he adduces no evidence for his opinion.
6. Sophocles, verses 264-65.
7. There is always the possibility, of course, that other evidence may be found in unpublished documents Cf. below, n. 41.
8. *Byzantinon bios* 3: 357.
9. See this book, Prologue and Epilogue, for gradual identification of ancient Hellenes and Byzantines in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.
10. Constantine Sathas (d. 1914) was a pioneering, zealous scholar who published many Byzantine and modern Greek sources for the first time.
11. *La tradition hellénique et la légende de Phidias de Praxitèle et de la fille d'Hippocrate au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1883), pp. 23 ff.
12. There seems to be no mention of his Albanian descent in the Byzantine sources. Furthermore, I know of no evidence for the presence of Albanians in Thrace at this time. Sathas discovered and printed the Vulgar Greek Cypriot translation of the Assizes of Romania. See n. 26, below.
13. P. Michalopoulos, in his commemorative brochure on Sathas' life, *Konstantinos Sathas, 1842-1914* (Athens; in Greek, 1949) p. 8, writes: "All, almost all the scientific theses that Sathas propounded on various ideological, linguistic, and philological matters . . . cannot bear proof."
14. Acrop., p. 96.
15. See *La tradition hellénique et la légende de Phidias*, etc., p. 28.
16. The *Mirabilia Romae* is a medieval collection of works (largely anonymous) concerned with the wonders of Rome. It describes the two colossal statues of Castor and Pollux whose bases bore the names of Phidias and Praxiteles. The two sculptors were believed to have come to Rome during the reign of the emperor Tiberius and to have promised to reveal certain things to him if he would build a monument to them—hence the statues, nude in order to



symbolize "that all human knowledge was naked to their eyes." *Mirabilia* is published in H. Jordan. *Topographie der Stadt Rom in Alterthum* (Berlin, 1871), 2: 619 ff. See also A. Hare, *Walks in Rome* (London, 1878), 1: 447.

17. For a review of Sathas' article, see the work of the Greek scholar N. Politis: *Hellenikoi Mesaionike Mythoi . . . Laografika Symmeikta* (Athens, 1921), 2: 7 ff. He is severe toward Sathas for lack of evidence regarding the Phidias-Praxiteles story. Politis points out that Michael Palaeologus, in his remarks mentioning the sculptors, did not say (as Sathas would have us believe) that one could not escape being burned "unless he were Phidias or Praxiteles," but that one could not avoid burning "unless he were a statue fashioned by those sculptors."
18. See C. Ducange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1843), 3: 238.
19. *Superstition and Force* (Philadelphia, 1892), p. 299.
20. *The Lascarids of Nicaea* (London, 1912), p. 192. Now also M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Lascarids of Nicaea* (London, 1975), who believes the ordeal came from the West. My book was in press when Angold's appeared.
21. *Les Institutions de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris, 1949), p. 243.
22. *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts* (Leipzig, 1894), 3: 407.
23. *Historia tou Basileiou tes Nikaias . . .* (in Greek; Athens, 1898), p. 406; "It came to the Byzantines from the Western peoples," meaning the Latins. See also A. Siatos, *Mia poineke dike kata Michael Palaiologou* (Athens, 1938), p. 29, who agrees on Latin provenience. His article is a popularized account of the trial.
24. *Histoire du droit Byzantin* (Paris, 1843-47), 3: 197 ff. and 208.
25. "Studien zum Hochverratsprozeß des Michael Paläologos im Jahre 1252," *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* (Athens, 1929-30), 8: 59-98.
26. Sathas first published the Greek version, *Assizes of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and Cyprus* (in Greek), *Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi* (Paris, 1877), 6: 1.
27. Czebe, "Studien," pp. 86-87.
28. George Pachymeres, *De Michael et Andronico Palaeologis*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1835), p. 33.
29. Acrop., p. 396.
30. Sphrantzes, *Annales*, p. 8.
31. See above, n. 6.
32. *Annae Comnenae Alexiadis, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn, 1839), 1: 243.
- 32a. Cf. K. Hadjipsaltes, "The Church of Cyprus and the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Nicaea," *Kypriakai Spoudai* (in Greek), 28 (1964): 14-68, on certain Greek ecclesiastical connections.
33. C. Diehl, *La Société byzantine à l'époque des Comnènes* (Paris, 1929), affirms that "Western customs penetrated the East in the 12th century, like the judicial duel or appeals to the judgment of God." But he, too, cites no evidence.
34. See *Les Assises des Romanie*, ed. G. Recoura (Paris, 1930), pp. 146-53; cf. also J. Lamonte, "Three Questions concerning the Assizes of Jerusalem," *Byzantina Metabyzantina* (New York, 1946), p. 210. P. Topping, *Assizes of Romania* (Philadelphia, 1949), p. 170, n. 20, says that Palaeologus, after declining